### MEETING

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

PUBLIC EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM

BOARD OF ADMINISTRATION

FINANCE & ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

ROBERT F. CARLSON AUDITORIUM

LINCOLN PLAZA NORTH

400 P STREET

SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 2017 10:58 A.M.

JAMES F. PETERS, CSR CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER LICENSE NUMBER 10063

### APPEARANCES

### COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

Mr. Richard Costigan, Chairperson

Ms. Theresa Taylor, Vice Chairperson

Mr. John Chiang, represented by Mr. Steve Juarez

Mr. J.J. Jelincic

Mr. Henry Jones

Mr. Bill Slaton

Ms. Betty Yee, represented by Ms. Lynn Paquin

### BOARD MEMBERS:

Mr. Michael Bilbrey

Mr. Richard Gillihan, represented by Ms. Katie Hagen

Ms. Dana Hollinger

Mr. Ron Lind

Ms. Priya Mathur

#### STAFF:

Ms. Marcie Frost, Chief Executive Officer

Mr. Ted Eliopoulos, Chief Investment Officer

Mr. Doug Hoffner, Deputy Executive Officer

Mr. Matthew Jacobs, General Counsel

Ms. Marlene Timberlake D'Adamo, Interim Chief Financial Officer

Mr. Scott Terando, Chief Actuary

Ms. Tanya Black, Committee Secretary

### APPEARANCES CONTINUED

### STAFF:

Mr. Forrest Grimes, Chief Risk Officer

Ms. Sabrina Hutchins, Chief, Enterprise Strategy & Performance Division

 ${\tt Ms.}$  Kimberly Malm, Chief, Operations Support Services Division

Ms. Arnita Paige, Chief, Pension Contract Management Services

Mr. Wylie Tollette, Chief Operating Investment Officer

### ALSO PRESENT:

Ms. Dani Charleston, Everyone Counts

Mr. Al Darby, Retired Public Employees Association

Mr. Pat Whalen, United Nurses Association of California, Union of Health Care Professionals

	INDEX	
		PAGE
1.	Call to Order and Roll Call	1
2.	Election of the Finance & Administration Committee Chair and Vice Chair	2
3.	Executive Report	4
4.	Consent Items Action Consent Items: a. Approval of the December 20, 2016, Finance & Administration Meeting Minutes b. California Actuarial Advisory Committee Appointment c. Long-Term Care Valuation Report	16
5.	Consent Items Information Consent Items: a. 2017 Annual Calendar Review b. 2018 Annual Calendar Review c. Draft Agenda for the April 18, 2017 Finance & Administration Committee Meeting d. Quarterly Chief Information Officer IT Report e. Treasury Analysis and Liquidity Report f. CalPERS 2016-17 Business Plan Mid-Year Update	16
Action Agenda Items		
6.	Business Planning a. CalPERS 2017-2022 Strategic Plan and CalPERS 2017-18 Business Plan	14
7.	Program Administration a. 2017 CalPERS Board of Administration Member-At-Large Election - Notice of Election b. Review of the Finance & Administration Committee Delegation, Board Governance Policy, and Policy for Approval of Reimbursement to State, School and Public Agency Employers of Elected Board Members	53 63
8.	Actuarial Reporting a. Actuarial Contribution Allocation Policy (Second Reading)	75

# I N D E X C O N T I N U E D PAGE 9. Asset Liability Management 79 Funding Risk Mitigation Policy Information Agenda Items 10. Program Administration Quarterly Collections & Termination Report 89 CalPERS Board of Administration Election -Voting Options Update 116 Application of Responsible Contractor Policy to all CalPERS Contracts 133 Asset Liability Management Asset Liability Management Policy a. (First Reading) 146 12. Summary of Committee Direction 148 13. Public Comment 149 Adjournment 150 Reporter's Certificate 151

## 1 PROCEEDINGS 2 CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Good morning. It is 3 11:00, so we are going to call to order the February 14th 4 meeting of the Finance and Administration Committee. Can we please call the roll? 5 6 COMMITTEE SECRETARY BLACK: Steve Juarez for John 7 Chianq? 8 ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER JUAREZ: Here. 9 COMMITTEE SECRETARY BLACK: Richard Costigan? 10 CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Here. COMMITTEE SECRETARY BLACK: J.J. Jelincic? 11 COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: Here. 12 13 COMMITTEE SECRETARY BLACK: Henry Jones? 14 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Here. 15 COMMITTEE SECRETARY BLACK: Bill Slaton? 16 COMMITTEE MEMBER SLATON: Here. 17 COMMITTEE SECRETARY BLACK: Theresa Taylor? 18 COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: Here. 19 COMMITTEE SECRETARY BLACK: Lynn Paquin for Betty 20 Yee? 21 ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER PAQUIN: Here. 22 CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Thank you very much. Next order of business is the election of the 23 24 Finance and Administration Committee Chair and Vice Chair.

For that I call on Mr. Slaton.

```
1
             COMMITTEE MEMBER SLATON: Thank you, Mr. Chair,
 2
    or Mr. Chair for the moment.
             So we'll now take nominations for Chair of the
 3
    Committee. And I'll call on Ms. Taylor.
 4
             COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: Yes. I'd like to
5
   nominate Richard Costigan for Chair. Richard Costigan has
6
7
    been running this committee, and it's an incredibly
    difficult committee. He's shown great leadership, and I'm
8
9
   proud to recommend Richard Costigan.
10
             COMMITTEE MEMBER SLATON: Thank you.
             No, it's a fun committee. Come on.
11
             Okay. Mr. Costigan's been nominated.
12
             Any further nominations?
13
             Any further nominations?
14
15
             Third and last time, any further nominations?
16
             With that, nominations will be closed.
17
             Do we hear a motion for election of Mr. Costigan?
18
             COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: So moved.
19
             COMMITTEE MEMBER SLATON: Moved by Jones.
20
             COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: Second.
             COMMITTEE MEMBER SLATON: Seconded by Taylor.
21
22
        All those in favor say aye.
23
             (Ayes.)
2.4
             COMMITTEE MEMBER SLATON: Opposed?
```

Motion carries.

```
1
             Congratulations, Mr. Costigan.
 2
             CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Thank you very much.
3
    Thank you.
 4
             (Applause.)
5
             CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: I'm going to call on
6
   Mr. Slaton again.
7
             Please push your microphone, Mr. Slaton.
8
             I'd call Mr. Slaton again.
9
             COMMITTEE MEMBER SLATON: Sure.
                                               So we're on a
10
   roll here. So I'd like to nominate Theresa Taylor to be
   Vice Chair of the Committee. She has great interest in
11
    the subject and really adds a great deal to our dialogue.
12
13
    So she'd make a great vice chair, so I would nominate her.
14
             CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: All right. Any further
15
   discussion?
16
             Can we get a motion on electing Ms. Taylor Vice
17
    Chair of the Committee.
18
             COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: I'll move.
19
             CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: It's been moved by
20
   Jelincic?
21
             COMMITTEE MEMBER SLATON:
                                        Second.
22
             CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Seconded by Slaton.
             All those in favor?
23
2.4
             (Ayes.)
25
             CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Opposed?
```

```
Motion carries.
1
 2
             Congratulations.
 3
             (Applause.)
 4
             CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Now we're going to take a
5
    30-second interlude while we play musical chairs.
6
             The real Committee Chair is going to tell us when
7
   we can start.
8
             (Laughter.)
9
             CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: All right. Well, good
10
    morning again. Happy Valentine's Day, everybody. So glad
11
    we could spend the day together.
12
             (Laughter.)
13
             CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Sure this is where you all
14
   want to be.
15
             So we're going to start with our new executive
16
    officer -- or, excuse me -- our Deputy Executive Officer
17
    for our committee.
18
             Welcome. Glad to have you here. If you just
19
    give -- before you give your executive officer report,
20
    just for those that don't know you, just give a quick
21
    overview of who you are, your background please.
22
             And I think you need to turn your mic on.
23
             INTERIM CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER TIMBERLAKE
24
   D'ADAMO: Thank you.
25
             First I'd like to say congratulations
```

Mr. Costigan and Ms. Taylor on the election as chair and vice chair respectively.

My name is Marlene Timberlake D'Adamo, and I am CalPERS' team member. I actually am the Chief Compliance Officer, and I am now stepping into the Interim Chief Financial Officer role while a search begins. I came to CalPERS in April of 2016 as Chief Compliance Officer from PNC Bank in Philadelphia where I served as the Senior Vice President of Portfolio and Risk Management.

My career has spanned about 20-plus years in financial services. I'm a lawyer by training. Don't hold that against me. And I'm really excited about stepping into this role on the interim level and working with the Committee.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Well, we are very thrilled to have you. And Ms. Eason did a fantastic job, and I know she's going to enjoy her new position back in her native city.

So welcome, and look forward to working with you in the next few months.

So with that we'd like to hear your executive report, please.

INTERIM CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER TIMBERLAKE D'ADAMO: Great. Thank you.

I would like to take a moment to recognize that

for the third straight year the CalPERS Financial Office has received the Government Finance Officers' Association Distinguished Budget Presentation Award for the CalPERS fiscal year 2016-17 annual budget report.

Thank you to this team for that.

Under the action consent items for Item b -- 4b staff recommends appointing Scott Terando, Chief Actuary, as the CalPERS representative to the California Actuarial Advisory Panel for the remainder of the three-year term ending December 2017.

Agenda Item 6a is our first action item. That is requesting the approval of the CalPERS 2017-2022 Strategic Plan and the 2017-2018 Business Plan initiatives.

Development of the new Strategic Plan was based on critical inputs and discussions throughout last year.

The second action item before the Committee is the 2017 CalPERS Board of Administration Member-at-Large Election - Notice of Election to fill two representative seats on the CalPERS Board that will begin on March 27th, 2017.

Agenda items 7b covers the review of the Finance and Administration Committee Delegation, proposed revision to the Board Governance Policy, and a recommended rescission of the Policy for Approval of Reimbursement to State, School, and Public Agency Employers of Elected

Board Members.

Also being heard before the Committee today is the second reading of the Actuarial Contribution Allocation Policy, which consolidates five existing actuarial policies related to the contribution allocation that was presented to the Committee during a December Finance and Administration meeting.

The last action item being presented is staff's recommendation to adopt the revised Funding Risk Mitigation Policy which has been updated per the Board's direction in December.

As an information item, and for the first time, the team will be presenting the Quarterly Collections & Termination Report or the Employer Partner Financial Health Report addressing the Board's comments to consider a potential legislative change for voluntary terminations, improvement of transparency of reporting delinquent agencies, and providing an update to the Board to improve the notification process to members.

Agenda Item 10b provides an update on the voting options for the CalPERS Board of Administration election process.

And 10c will provide information on the application of the Responsible Contractor Policy to all CalPERS contracts.

8

The next Finance and Administration Committee meeting is scheduled for April 18th, 2017, and will include updates for the employer and employee contribution rates for judges, legislators, state school and valuation report for the 1959 Survivor Benefit Plan; the first reading of the 2017-2018 annual budget proposal; annual review of the Board member employer reimbursements; and second reading of the asset liability management policy. Thank you, Mr. Chair. This concludes my report. And I'd be happy to take any questions. CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Thank you very much. We are going to pull off item 5d, which is the Quarterly Chief Information Officer IT Report. There's going to be a question on that, so we have someone from that office, Mr. Hoffner. Okay. Great. Okay. So we'll go back to item -- the action consent items. Any questions? COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Move it. VICE CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Second. CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: It's moved by Jones, seconded by Taylor. All those in favor? (Ayes.)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

Oh, I'm sorry.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN:

```
Mr. Jelincic just added in. my apologies.
1
             COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: Yeah.
 2
             CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Mr. Jelincic.
 3
 4
             COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: Yeah. I will support
5
    the motion. But I do want to note that on page 4 of the
6
    minutes, the top paragraph is -- actually reflects what
7
    happened. Staff did tell us that. Although it's a
8
    violation of policy, but we're going to change the policy
9
    later this meeting to comply with the minutes. But I just
10
    wanted to point out that we --
11
             CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Thank you, Mr. Jelincic.
   Great catch.
12
13
             Okay. With that notation, again we had a motion
14
    and been seconded.
15
             Again, all in favor?
16
             (Ayes.)
17
             CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Opposed?
             Motion carries.
18
19
             Thank you.
20
             Item 5d. Let's go ahead and take that up, Mr.
21
   Hoffner, or who is going to speak to 5d?
             INTERIM CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER TIMBERLAKE
22
23
   D'ADAMO: The IT report?
2.4
             CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Yes, ma'am.
25
             And I'm going to call on Mr. Gillihan.
```

BOARD MEMBER GILLIHAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I just want to note - and I'm looking at page 101 of the iPad, version -- I'm not sure what it is in the stand -- page 2 of 6 on the item.

And I appreciate the reporting on the status of the IT projects, which kind of -- without some visibility kind of just operate in the shadows, and the Board doesn't see much about it. But I had some concerns about the information that's displayed, or the lack there of. And I'm specifically referring to the Actuarial Valuation System Redesign and Enhance Project. I'm not sure how you pronounce the acronym, Bill, so I'll leave it at that.

But, for example, it notes that the project's behind schedule. But it doesn't explain why or what's being done about that. I would also note that all the project updates, none of them report on risks; none of them report on costs, both projected and expended to date; and they don't include other information like start dates, so we have no context for how long these things have been going on and how they're progressing along the timeline. So I know I don't sit on the Committee, but I would just ask that perhaps in the future, Mr. Chair, if we could consider adding a little more detail to provide the Board context about the nature of the projects and how they're proceeding.

The thing about IT projects and the reason I'm concerned about them is, you know, unlike capital construction projects, you see pieces being built, and when its done, you end up with a bridge or a building, something that's functional. IT projects have the unique characteristic of being able to have a lot of money spent and unfortunately at times nothing to show for it in the end. So I think it's particularly important that the Board pays attention to the project status and the progress through our normal monthly meetings.

So thank you.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Mr. Hoffner.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER HOFFNER: Thank you for the question.

So we had a 45-day schedule overrun at the end of last year. And so that relates to why it was off-track in terms of that reporting. The project's to be completed in October of 2018. And we're happy to bring back additional information on all of these subjects, and so I think this is going to dovetail into overall enterprise performance measurements and reporting in terms of getting the strategic planning and the outputs that it will be providing back to the full Board on an incremental basis.

So I appreciate the feedback. We'll be happy to include additional information on all the projects to meet

the needs of the Board. And the overall goal will be to have this in a comprehensive enterprise performance structure. So you'll have to see that information at your fingertips on a going-forward basis.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: So I think Mr. Gillihan raises an excellent question -- an excellent point. We should calendar this for a relatively soon Finance and Administration Committee meeting to go over this, because I am sure you watched the FI\$Cal hearing by the legislature this week or last week, the three-hour-plus meeting. So at some point I think, Mr. Gillihan, you're right just a little more detail, particularly since the legislature took an interest in FI\$Cal.

Mr. Hoffner.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER HOFFNER: Yes. So the other thing I just want to point out, we'll be doing a workshop in the May time frame for the Board related to the Information Technology Project. So that will provide additional light in terms of that feedback.

And then, if it was yesterday, I missed the other hearing because we were here with you all day. So...

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: It wasn't yesterday.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER HOFFNER: Okay. Then if it was last week, then I missed it.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: It was last week. They

all blend together. But I thought Ms. Tong and the Director of FI\$Cal did a nice job, but many of the similar questions, so...

All right.

 $\label{eq:committee} \mbox{COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC:} \quad \mbox{I have another} \\ \mbox{question on that, if I may.}$ 

Somebody said you were -- you were warned this question was coming. This is on F, page 2 of 3, 121 of the iPad. We've changed the title from "CalPERS Pension Prefunding Trust" to "Pension Rate Stabilization Prefunding Vehicle." And I asked both about dropping CalPERS and what's the difference between a trust and a vehicle, and you were -- go ahead, enlighten me.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER HOFFNER: Thank you, Mr. Jelincic. So I think the dropping the title CalPERS was sort of specific. All these things related to the organization.

As you may recall, we had a discussion last year about pursuing a legislation related to a trust. That was something that we were unable to get a sponsor for, and there was a discussion within this Committee about were it should pursue an additional -- again vehicle was the discussion point many rather than a trust itself. And so we modified that language. I think this goes back to the March time frame when he had that item up before.

So effectively there was a discussion about continuing dialogue around this area. But I think Mr. Slaton was the one that was pushing pretty significantly hard on this, and that modified the language based upon feedback from the Board.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: All right. These were information items.

Any other questions?

No. Okay.

Next set of items are action items. So we're going to go to 6a.

Mr. Hoffner, the CalPERS 2017-22 Strategic Plan an 2017-2018 Business Plan.

(Thereupon an overhead presentation was Presented as follows.)

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER HOFFNER: Thank you,
Mr. Chair. Doug Hoffner, and Sabrina Hutchins' here with
a team member from CalPERS Enterprise Strategy Performance
Division. I'm just going to kick off this item and then
Sabrina will walk you through it.

Effectively for the last year we've been working on a strategic plan for the next five years for the organization. This kicked off in early 2016 under direction of Anne Stausboll as our CEO. We carried this

through with board workshops and interviews with 40-plus stakeholders internally and externally. And you were all participants of that.

These workshops carried through our July off-site and other sessions we had last year with you. brought a first reading of this item to you in December. Then effectively today is the second reading, and hoping to get concurrence and support from you. We do have a few items for additional work to be done. We'll -- Sabrina will talk about that. And we've got a session at the July off-site to talk more about a few items that need to be concluded in terms of your feedback. But the real hope here is getting your concurrence and support, effectively moving this forward. This will roll into our building up budget cycles that will be presented back to you in the April and May time frames of this year, and establishes build out of our business plans for the current fiscal year coming to be effective July 1 of 2017.

So with that, I'd like to turn this presentation over to Sabrina, and we'll walk through the plans, both the business plan for one year and the five-year strategic plan.

Thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

ENTERPRISE STRATEGY & PERFORMANCE DIVISION CHIEF HUTCHINS: Thank you. Good morning, Mr. Chair and members

of the Committee. Sabrina Hutchins, CalPERS team member.

So as Doug mentioned, in December the Committee heard the first reading of the Strategic Plan. And today we're bringing this topic back to you to solicit your feedback for final review and approval. This approval does also include our Business Plan Initiatives that would align to the first year of our Strategic Plan. And this timing keeps us in alignment with our normal business and budget planning cycles.

This work is also important to the integration of our enterprise risk conversations as well as those processes.

Realizing this is a very comprehensive plan, I wanted to set the stage and review the key points of what we wanted to hit on this morning. So first, we will review the components of the strategic plan and -- let me make this slide -- there we go.

--000--

ENTERPRISE STRATEGY & PERFORMANCE DIVISION CHIEF HUTCHINS: -- and really show how those components connect. In addition, we want to share how we're going to bring this information back to you on a regular basis through a new reporting structure. And then we'll conclude with a high level review of our goals and objectives. Ultimately again our goal is to receive

approval of the plan providing strategic direction and guidance to the organization.

--000--

ENTERPRISE STRATEGY & PERFORMANCE DIVISION CHIEF HUTCHINS: So I also wanted to take a moment to highlight the supporting material as part of this agenda item, as they really housed the supporting details and data. And so first within attachment 1, this is our Strategic Plan document that would live out on the CalPERS website, and encompasses at a high level our vision, mission, our goals, objections[sic], and all the way down to the measure and target level.

Attachment 2 is the business Plan Initiatives that outlines those activities that we would take on in the first year of the Strategic Plan, so the '17-'18 cycle.

Attachment 3 is an alignment map which shows you at a high level, at-a-glance view of all of those components within the plan.

And then attachment 4 is your strategic measures dashboard that gives you the details behind measures, targets, and the baselines that we already have established.

So these materials really provide the foundation and starting points for staff to work from.

At the heart of these goals is the organization's vision and mission. And as you are aware, we did refresh our statements as part of this planning process.

Incorporating the CalPERS' core values when you view the vision and mission really brings additional clarity to who we are and what we stand for.

--000--

ENTERPRISE STRATEGY & PERFORMANCE DIVISION CHIEF HUTCHINS: So to reinforce the connectivity of each of those components within the plan I wanted to highlight how they work together. So, again, in alignment with our vision and mission, we have established five strategic goals which will set our priorities over the next five years. For each of these goals you have connecting strategic objectives that provide the organization-focused direction and really brings clarity to how we're going to achieve our goals. Each objective has one or more measures and targets that is going to provide insight to measuring our progress along the way, as well as facilitating decision making.

And then again, the Business Plan Initiatives are those more tactical activities that will help us move the needle related to our measures and targets ultimately supporting our overarching goals and objectives.

--000--

ENTERPRISE STRATEGY & PERFORMANCE DIVISION CHIEF HUTCHINS: So before we take a look at the specifics of our Strategic Plan components, I wanted to highlight how we're going to bring this information back to you for review and feedback going forward.

2.4

As we implement this new plan, we have the opportunity to revise our reporting structure and process, and we have taken into account the Board feedback we've received throughout this planning process, as well as feedback we've received from Marie as she has engaged with all of you on this topic.

Our goal is to provide the right level of information as well as utilize the tools that we have to provide you with those additional details that are timely and appropriate.

So using a holistic view through an enterprise performance reporting system, we can highlight these key insights related to our strategic objectives through our measures and targets as well as our Business Plan Initiatives and then additional information about our core processes that we're going to highlight through key performance indicators. And these would be more operational and perspective.

--000--

ENTERPRISE STRATEGY & PERFORMANCE DIVISION CHIEF

HUTCHINS: So all of these performance reports would focus on an at-risk status rating and provide insight to those root cause analysis. We would also still provide data of the full spectrum of all of our performance measures. And this could be via the Board books on a regular basis or other forms of communication.

As part of the Enterprise Performance Reporting System, we are introducing two new elements which include our thresholds related to our strategic measures as well as those key performance indicators or KPIs.

So we are currently in the process of identifying and developing these elements, and we will be presenting this information to you at the July offsite.

Specifically related to those thresholds, in order for us to report something at risk, thresholds would need to be established to identify that acceptable range below or above the targets that we've already established. All of these measurements would be reported on a quarterly basis. And this would also incorporate an ad hoc reporting cycle so when measurements are chronically off track or at risk, we would make sure we come back to you with that information more timely.

--000--

ENTERPRISE STRATEGY & PERFORMANCE DIVISION CHIEF HUTCHINS: So the approach for the reporting timeline for

the first year would consist of again first thought workshop; level setting at the timing of the commencement of this plan, which is July 1st of this year; we would share our recommendations for the thresholds related to the measures and targets; and we would ask for your feedback on those thresholds.

We would also introduce what we've identified as our key performance indicators.

To give us some time to gain some momentum on all of the additional performance measures moving forward, we would come back with a first report on our strategic measures in February of 2018, followed by our Business Plan Initiatives in June and then our KPIs in September. And then this cycle will continue from there on a regular quarterly basis, again focusing on those at-risk indicators.

So now I'd like to call your attention to the alignment map, which was attachment 3. We did also pass out a handout just so it's more clear visually. But there were no changes.

And, again, this view gives you that snapshot of the entire plan, which is very comprehensive.

And it's not my intent to go over each one of these boxes in detail. But I did want to highlight of course our five strategic goals.

--000--

ENTERPRISE STRATEGY & PERFORMANCE DIVISION CHIEF HUTCHINS: So as you look at this map from left to right, you have to strengthen the long-term sustainability of the pension fund, transform health care purchasing and delivery to achieve affordability, to reduce complexity across the enterprise, to cultivated a risk intelligent organization, and to promote a high performing and diverse workforce.

You see underneath that we have 14 strategic objectives that align to each one of our goals that we've established. Then aligned to those objectives are measures and targets. In this view you're seeing a very high level of those measures and targets. But you can find the details for the baselines and additional descriptions in attachment 4.

You'll also notice on this map that we have a about 10 boxes that are bolded in their outlines. And this denotes those measures that do still need some additional refinements. And again being that this plan we're still pending approval and it commences in July 1, there's some work that we need to do to establish those baselines.

But the additional 26 measures, this is where we have data available, and those baselines have already been

established.

And then at the bottom layer of the map are the Business Plan Initiatives. And again this is the work that would align to the first year of the Strategic Plan. We have 37 Business Plan Initiatives to kick things off in that first year, as we are proactively planning to move the needle related to those measures and targets.

I would like to call out that there was an error in the actual agenda item that says we had 32 Business Plan Initiatives, but we in fact have 37 as reflected on your map there.

And again, for any initiatives, and we -- just a few that would be aligned to the budget planning cycle, those will be provided in more detail at your budget agenda item in April. Again, our goal here today is to get your approval on the strategic plan components to provide the organization direction, the ability to set priorities and plan our resources.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: I have a question.

ENTERPRISE STRATEGY & PERFORMANCE DIVISION CHIEF HUTCHINS: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: So not to wordsmith, but just back to the circle of our vision, mission, and core values. And so you look at -- I was asking Mr. Juarez here, on the fund sustainability, I know that it is a core

mission. But what I'm sort of not seeing in the circle is part of our mission is to ensure the payment of the benefits. So where is that captured? I mean, we talked about health care affordability and transform health care -- fine. We talked about reducing complexity. Going 32 to 37 is a little more complex for me, but -- so we're not meeting that objective, Mr. Hoffner, quite yet.

But where is it in the circle -- or is this not the proper document for that? It's part of the Strategic Plan. Because sustainability of the fund would imply that we're making the payment of the benefits and we're strengthening it. But we've put in here - as you said, this will be on our website - vision, mission, core values.

ENTERPRISE STRATEGY & PERFORMANCE DIVISION CHIEF HUTCHINS: Right. So and then the outer circle is your focus on fund sustainability. And so all of the objectives that correlate to that goal would be those items that would help us focus on strengthening the system.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: But if I were looking at this document externally -- I know, so you're going back to cross-referencing, so someone has to read the main document.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER HOFFNER: Mr. Costigan,

so in our Strategic Plan includes this visual document as well as the narrative associated with each one of the fund sustainability initiatives. It's well -- along with the other five strategic positions.

So what you'll have here is a document that looks like this in a narrative fashion that breaks that out for you. So I think it -- I think it meets your -- meets the needs of maybe the question that was raised. It's not fully depicted in that overarching picture.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: No, and I understand. The question -- you wanted feedback, so I'm just giving you all feedback. I mean, as the vice chair's pointing out, you're absolutely right, that information is captured in this very lengthy complex document. As most of you all in this room know, I have a short attention span. This is not -- this document here -- I just want to make sure just as we look for feedback. This is a fantastic document. If it accomplishes it because the cross-references is great.

This is a very complex document, the chart that we're looking at. It shows it all. So I just -- that's giving you all a little bit of feedback. We'll go through some questions.

So we'll go to Ms. Taylor -- Vice Chair Taylor.

VICE CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: I had a question.

You're talking about some of these not being completed and bringing them forward in July, but you want us to pass the whole plan anyway?

ENTERPRISE STRATEGY & PERFORMANCE DIVISION CHIEF HUTCHINS: Well, the primary focus of the approval is really on our goals and objectives and then our Business Plan Initiatives. And then, you know, the strategic measures really demonstrate how we're going to measure our progress going forward.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER HOFFNER: So let me clarify for the Vice Chair.

So it's to the point that Sabrina just raised. It's -- we think you had captured what we view as the strategic initiatives and objectives there. The pieces that need additional work unattended are shaded in attachment 4, really relate to the thresholds and/or how we're going to measure that performance. And so there's a little bit of additional work that's left there. And so -- for like 10 of the 36 items. So we want to at least be forthcoming and say here are the 26 that are we think meeting that test. There are a few more to be additional -- additional work to be done, mainly around establishing the survey questions. And then we'll get you the trend data so we have a threshold and a baseline, because these are newer things.

But we're fundamentally looking for concurrence on the high level strategic plan. And that the performance and those other thresholds will be -- for those 10 will be brought back to you in that workshop.

And so we're trying to bifurcate the issue a little bit so that we're not presenting 36 specific initiatives to you at one point in time, and that we can continue to build the plan for that kickoff date of July 1.

VICE CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Okay. I'll leave it to my colleagues if they have additional questions on these. I'm a little concerned that four of these that we need to come back to are in the health care affordability out of a total of -- out of 10. So 40 percent.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER HOFFNER: Yeah. So there is -- there is some data though if you look on attachment 4 under the current status. And so that identifies where we are in terms of our baseline today. And we -- what we need to get to is establishing the sort of trends we want to accomplish in the 1-, 3-, 5-year time horizon. You are correct, there are several within that health care space. But that's where additional work needs to be done to get to the point that you're comfortable that we're hitting those thresholds and that we can then be held accountable for the performance over time.

VICE CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Great. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: All right. We're going to do Committee members first, if that's okay. So we have several.

Mr. Jelincic.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: A number of things.

The attachment 3 is much easier to read in hard copy, and

I thank you for that.

ENTERPRISE STRATEGY & PERFORMANCE DIVISION CHIEF HUTCHINS: You're welcome.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: I want to go back to the issue that Rich raised on paying benefits. I mean, that's why we exist. And it's not listed in this circle. And if you look at the details on the following five or six pages, payment of benefits doesn't show up there either. So I think it really does need to rise higher in the priority, and it be very explicit that that's why we exist.

On the fund sustainability, which is 7 -- it's attachment 1, 7, I agree that those reflect the Board's priorities. I continue to be bothered by the fact that we concentrated on avoiding the downside and pay no attention to what the cost is. You know, we don't pay any attention to what's the upside we're walking away from.

Our job is to balance risk. And you can't balance risk if you don't look at both sides. As Bob

Carlson used to say, our biggest risk is no risk.

On page 8, "Deliver target risk-adjusted investment returns," I think that in fact is one of the things we really want. But I will point out that you get what you pay for, and our compensation plan does not risk adjust. And so we really do need to think about, are we serious about risk adjustment or are we not?

Page 13, which is 173 of the iPad, is the survey. And again, I just want to put in a plug. I really want the question to come back about favoritism. Hopefully we will get there.

And those observations also apply to attachment 4 in the various places, but I'm not going to repeat them there.

So thank you.

ENTERPRISE STRATEGY & PERFORMANCE DIVISION CHIEF HUTCHINS: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: So, Mr. Jelincic, I would -- I have a follow-up question.

In order to give it additional feedback when you were talking both about risk and cost, what do you as a recommendation -- or what do you see that the document's lacking?

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: I'm not sure I
25 understand what your question is.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Well, as I understood your question is, we're not capturing part of the cost aspect and we're not capturing part of the risk. So in order to give Mr. Hoffner a little bit of feedback, what is it that -- in order to make -- to achieve the goal that you're seeking or the information you're seeking? Just a recommendation, I mean, a little bit of feedback.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: We need to look at not just the avoiding falling to 50 percent funded. We need to look at, well, what is it -- how much have we reduced our risk of getting to 110 percent funded? That's a risk we kind of like. But you can't look at just the downside and not look at the upside.

Part of the change in the discount rate is because we have focused on the very short term and made it more -- our asset allocation more and more conservative. There is a cost to that that needs to be balanced. We need to -- because we're not just only with sharp increases employer contributions, but we have a desire for lower contributions for the employer.

You know, we -- you know, the expected volatility -- you know, there's a -- you know, we've set this goal of 8, but that really implies something about what we are willing to accept in expected returns. And I'm not sure we actually are willing to accept what it

would take to get an 8 volatility, which is probably approaching, well, 4 or 5 percent return on the investments.

So we -- it's a balancing game and we need to recognize that both sides of that equation exist.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: All right. Thank you, Mr. Jelincic.

Mr. Slaton.

COMMITTEE MEMBER SLATON: Yeah. Just to address one item that Mr. Jelincic mentioned, and I've got some other questions.

As staff has pointed out to us on multiple occasions, it's an asymmetric risk. So while he has -you are correct that we do need to look at both sides, the risks are asymmetric when we are at the 60-some-odd percent funding level. So different set of analysis if you were at 85 percent.

But, anyway, I want to come back to this model.

There's a lot of these that -- this is a five-year plan. And as you know, I've been an advocate for measurements that we can look at and say, how are we doing?

A lot of these are establish a baseline and then look for a downward trend. So it's a five-year plan. By when should we have those baselines? So if we -- if we

don't have an actual measurement we can look at today, to me to hold you accountable is to say, okay, by when will we have the baselines for those?

And then there are others that we have measurements. And I'll just pick out one of them:
Achieve overall satisfaction rate customer experience for key business process of 95 percent. And we're 86 percent as of November 2016.

So is the -- should we hold you accountable only for getting to 95 in five years or should you be held accountable of getting to 90 by some interim date? So I don't see the interim dates in here where you can report to us and we can say -- check that off and say, okay, you accomplished that.

Otherwise it's a five-year plan with all of
the -- except for the ones that say it's longer than five
years. I didn't see any of them that say we're going to
get it done by year one or year three. And so to me,
that's what this Board member would like to see.

By the way, I think there's an error on the mental health one, where we talk about young people 12 to 17 years old, and we have the current status of 5.1. These are instances of severe mental health problems, and we have a goal of 7.

So I don't think we're trying to go that

direction.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

ENTERPRISE STRATEGY & PERFORMANCE DIVISION CHIEF HUTCHINS: All right. We will take a look at that.

COMMITTEE MEMBER SLATON: Unless I'm misreading it.

ENTERPRISE STRATEGY & PERFORMANCE DIVISION CHIEF HUTCHINS: Okay. To your point about the other -- the baselines and holding us accountable for -- and that goes to our conversation that we want to go into more detail at the July offsite. All of the -- out of the 36 measures, we do have baselines for a majority of them. And then the 10 that we did outline, most of those baselines will be established as of either March or June of this year. So, again, we're really ahead of the game really trying to be prepared for July 1. And so there's still a lot of work that is like in process of happening. So we feel pretty confident about where we are with the -- at least the data that we have today. And our goal would be to work with you to establish what's that threshold then. So if we need to be accountable for a particular measure in a one-year period, that's certainly something that we can do over the five-year timeline.

COMMITTEE MEMBER SLATON: Yeah. I would suggest that, you know, staff needs to come forward with those. We can't create them.

ENTERPRISE STRATEGY & PERFORMANCE DIVISION CHIEF
HUTCHINS: Right.

2.4

COMMITTEE MEMBER SLATON: We would need to do them in concert with you and reach mutual agreement. But I think that the --

ENTERPRISE STRATEGY & PERFORMANCE DIVISION CHIEF HUTCHINS: Yes, absolutely.

COMMITTEE MEMBER SLATON: But I think that the initial targets and their timelines need to come from you; and then our feedback is, are we comfortable with that and are we in agreement?

12 ENTERPRISE STRATEGY & PERFORMANCE DIVISION CHIEF
13 HUTCHINS: Very good.

COMMITTEE MEMBER SLATON: Thank you.

15 ENTERPRISE STRATEGY & PERFORMANCE DIVISION CHIEF 16 HUTCHINS: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Mr. Hoffner, so we will see timelines prior to the July Board meeting?

So I know you're wanting us to adopt this as a second reading, but I think Mr. Slaton has raised some great -- it's an element that's missing. And so when would we potentially be able to see the metrics come back for dates?

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER HOFFNER: So I think the question is, to Sabrina's point, there are some that will

be finalized for presentation in the March and/or through June time frame. So we either have the material before you before that other workshop or on a basis or we have it all rolled up for you at that point in time at the July offsite for your review and approval.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: So you need this adopted prior to that? I mean, I guess the question --

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER HOFFNER: Well, we're developing our budgets for this July 1, '17 to '18 fiscal year, and we're developing the Business Plan Initiatives for '17 -- '18 that could be encompassed within those budget timelines and priorities. So that's kind of the structure we're working toward is having that all rolled up and having it available to be kicked off because we'll be getting into the first year of the five-year plan. So that's what we're looking for your concurrence and support on is that the things that we're working on today to roll up to that are in fact what you want us to do, and then hold us accountable for going forward.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Mr. Slaton.

COMMITTEE MEMBER SLATON: Yeah, just to add clarity to that. I agree with you. You know strategic plans are always works in progress, they are always being updated and changed and tweaked as situations change. So I'm in favor of us approving this today as the basic

framework, and then there's -- as it indicates, there's work to do, to flesh it out even more so we know where we're headed. But I'd be in favor of it. And if you need a motion, I'd be happy to make it.

 $\label{eq:chain-person} \mbox{Costigan: There are a few more} \\ \mbox{questions. But I'll call on you when we get there.}$ 

Ms. Paquin.

ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER PAQUIN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Overall, you know, we're very happy with progress of the Strategic Plan, and I really do like the dashboard that you have as attachment 4. I think that makes it very easy to follow.

And I think to Mr. Slaton's question, were you planning to use the annual business plan to show incremental progress in some of the measures? So instead of saying, you know, by in five years we'll be this far along, by year two we'll be here?

ENTERPRISE STRATEGY & PERFORMANCE DIVISION CHIEF HUTCHINS: Yes. So the Business Plan Initiatives will give you incremental progress of the tactical activities that we're working on to achieve our overall goals. That would be coming back to you on that quarterly reporting cycle. So you will hear regular progress updates.

And each year, as we've done in the past, we

refresh our Business Plan Initiatives, our plan. So every year you would see what are we planning for the next year.

ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER PAQUIN: Okay. Now I do have a question on the '17-'18 business plan. This is on page 1 of the plan under "Strategic Objective - Integrate environmental, social, and governance considerations into investment decision making."

And currently this shows the development of a framework for the integration to be completed by June 2020. And I was curious, does the Investment staff believe it will take three years to actually develop a framework, or is this for a hundred percent integration?

ENTERPRISE STRATEGY & PERFORMANCE DIVISION CHIEF HUTCHINS: That's a very good question. I might need some help from my Investment team.

CHIEF INVESTMENT OFFICER ELIOPOULOS: Hi there.

Ted Eliopoulos, Chief Investment Officer.

Well, we think it will take five years to develop the framework for integrating ESG. And as our plan demonstrates, that is a huge endeavor and will be iterative as the plan goes forward in terms of what is success, in terms of integrating that ESG into our considerations.

I think in terms of our goal for the five years is to have a hundred percent compliance by all of our

external and internal managers to have plans and procedures in place to integrate ESG into the decision making. So it's a bit of a word construct, but the framework should be complete. And in that framework each external-internal manager will have policy and procedures in place to do the integration. And what the integration is, how that looks, that will develop over time.

ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER PAQUIN: Okay. So this plan says the framework will be completed by June 2020, so within three, three and a half years. So, are you envisioning that as an iterative process and that managers will be called to task to start integrating throughout the three years or are you going to take the next three years to actually develop a framework and then start the enforcement of that integration?

CHIEF INVESTMENT OFFICER ELIOPOULOS: We're already asking each of our managers to provide us reports on how they're going about integrating ESG into their decision making. We will have at the Investment Committee in March a further discussion of how that is going. But this is a very new area of practice, so there's great variety and variability about -- within each asset class and within each manager how they're approaching this. So I think it's going to take the full five years to really understand what are best practices, how ESG has integrated

into decision making. And that will come into focus much more during the course of this five-year plan.

ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER PAQUIN: Okay. All right. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Ms. Mathur.

BOARD MEMBER MATHUR: Thank you. Excuse me.

Well, first I just want to say that I think that this strategic plan process has been a really constructive and useful one, and I think it's borne out in a document that is clear and really does articulate the goals and objectives of this Board and the organization as a whole. So I want to applaud you and your teams for very a successful effort.

ENTERPRISE STRATEGY & PERFORMANCE DIVISION CHIEF HUTCHINS: Thank you.

BOARD MEMBER MATHUR: Second I wanted to respond to Mr. Costigan's earlier concern about nothing -- about the question of whether delivering benefits should be articulated on this circle charge that's up on the screen. And on the chart in the center you have the word "MISSION," which really our mission is to delivery retirement and health benefits to members and their beneficiaries. And perhaps rather than just having the word "MISSION," you could actually put the words "OF THE MISSION," which I know would make the chart a little bit

less pretty, but maybe that would go towards achieving the concerns or addressing the concerns of the Chair. So I was just -- that's just a suggestion.

ENTERPRISE STRATEGY & PERFORMANCE DIVISION CHIEF HUTCHINS: And I'll just note that this view which is for the PowerPoint, but actually the strategy map in the actual plan does lay out the words of the vision, mission, and core values.

BOARD MEMBER MATHUR: So then it's already there?

ENTERPRISE STRATEGY & PERFORMANCE DIVISION CHIEF

11 HUTCHINS: It is there.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

BOARD MEMBER MATHUR: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: And I guess the struggle is again is -- this is a great visual document. We're asking folks to go to another document that has a lot of information on it. So --

ENTERPRISE STRATEGY & PERFORMANCE DIVISION CHIEF HUTCHINS: Understood.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: All right. Ms. Taylor.

BOARD MEMBER MATHUR: No, no, I'm not done.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Oh, I'm sorry.

Sorry.

(Laughter.)

BOARD MEMBER MATHUR: So I did want to just ask a question. And I think it's been raised in other ways

today. But some of these strategic measures are very precise, so they have a number and a target. Others are less precise. So, for example, I'm just looking at fund sustainability.

The strategic measure around probability of a sharp increase in employer contribution rates is a low probability of single-year employer increase of 5 percent of payroll for miscellaneous or 7 percent of payroll for safety.

But what does a low probability mean? What is a low probability, I guess. You know, we don't have a number there where the low probability is. So I guess that's my -- my question on some of these is, are we going to get more precise on what the target is or are we going to sort of know it when we see it?

ENTERPRISE STRATEGY & PERFORMANCE DIVISION CHIEF HUTCHINS: You know, that's a good question. And if it's not described in the actual dashboard where there's a little bit more details, then we can certainly do better work on that.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER HOFFNER: Yeah. It's not. So I think we need to bring that back. And I think that's the kind of feedback we're looking for so that what gets finally adopted and approved and expectations of both the Board and the work that we do on behalf of the

membership is consistent, so that we're in concert about what low probability is.

BOARD MEMBER MATHUR: So there are others like that around the probability of high employer contribution rates. It's just a decrease.

How much of a decrease? I mean, there's a 0.01 percent decrease, there's a 20 percent decrease. They're materially different. So I guess getting a little bit --sharpening the pencil a little bit on those would be helpful.

ENTERPRISE STRATEGY & PERFORMANCE DIVISION CHIEF HUTCHINS: Absolutely. We will do that. And that will be the work that we would bring back to the next session as well.

BOARD MEMBER MATHUR: Okay. Terrific.

ENTERPRISE STRATEGY & PERFORMANCE DIVISION CHIEF HUTCHINS: And then I'd like to applaud the organization in general just for the maturity level of having these measures in place before the plan even starts. So it was a significant milestone for us this time. So we're getting better as we're moving along.

BOARD MEMBER MATHUR: I certainly think we are.

And I think having these -- you know, some strong measures in here, some of which are very -- are going to be challenging to achieve -- is a sign of maturity, and I

1 really respect it, and then --

2.4

ENTERPRISE STRATEGY & PERFORMANCE DIVISION CHIEF HUTCHINS: Thank you.

BOARD MEMBER MATHUR: -- look forward to seeing how we use this tool moving forward.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Thank you, Ms. Mathur. Great questions.

Ms. Taylor, we'll go back to you very quickly.

VICE CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Sure. I'm kind of following up on what Ms. Paquin was talking about. And I guess maybe that means Ted has to come back up.

So, I think one of my questions was, you were talking about implementing the mana -- the managers have the policies and procedures for integrating our ESG. You said that it will probably take five years to complete that.

CHIEF INVESTMENT OFFICER ELIOPOULOS: (Nods head.)

VICE CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Do you have -- and I think my question is maybe better asked in the Investment Committee. But I think because we're not seeing it here in the Strategic Plan, I would think that there would be a better definition of benchmarking for that. Because I -- you gave kind of a nebulous answer. So I was a little

concerned that it -- that we're not even going to have a benchmark of any kind in between the five years. Am I incorrect, I'm hoping?

CHIEF INVESTMENT OFFICER ELIOPOULOS: Yeah, so I think you -- here's what's in the document. I'll start with that.

First is the developing a framework piece. And this area I'll just underscore is a very nascent and new area in the investment world, investment practices.

CalPERS is seen as the leader in the area of ESG work and, importantly, the work of trying to integrate ESG considerations into decision making.

That's why the strategic objective is, you know, at a level of abstraction of developing a framework because it's pioneering work. There is no benchmark. I wish we could take off a -- you know, from a menu or a playbook or a benchmark that we have and measure in our investment performance to put in. We are creating new territory here.

As a result, during our workshops what we had agreed on for a measurement - and it's not really -- as you say, it's really not a benchmark - is during the course of this five-year period to have 100 percent of our internal and external managers have a policy and procedures in place to take into consideration ESG

considerations into investment decision making. So that is the benchmark, if you will. That is the measurement over this five-year time period, is whether or not we can, one, construct the framework and have the policy and procedures in place so that it is working; and that's a very ambitious goal given, you know, how nascent this area is.

VICE CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Okay. So that's -CHIEF INVESTMENT OFFICER ELIOPOULOS: Is that
helpful?

VICE CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: That's a little helpful. I appreciate it. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: So, Mr. Eliopoulos, you might just want to stay. May not be any questions but weather them back and forth.

Ms. Hollinger.

BOARD MEMBER HOLLINGER: Thank you. Appreciate it.

I really appreciate this work. I realize the enormity of the job and to try to get it on one piece of paper.

I just have food for thought, a suggestion. I noticed that under fund sustainability it says funded status, a hundred percent with acceptable risk. But then in the notes obviously we -- it says something that would

be beyond the time year -- five-year time frame.

So my suggestion would be, what do we think is realistic in the five years? Do we think maybe of putting a funded status of 75, 80 percent just as something that's potentially -- that's potentially attainable? It's just a thought, a suggestion as what -- to start getting us thinking --

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Well, we'll start with Mr. Hoffner.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER HOFFNER: Well -BOARD MEMBER HOLLINGER: -- as what we think

12 | could be real --

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER HOFFNER: You're speaking about like a threshold that would be --

BOARD MEMBER HOLLINGER: As what we think could be at least, yeah, attainable, like a hundred -- you know.

17 CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: We're going to have our 18 CE --

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER HOFFNER: So I think the question is, is it attainable? And that's a five-year -- it's a five-year plan, what we currently identify as something beyond -- in it's asterisk beyond the five years. So I think the question is maybe beyond just my input here given the question.

But we could definitely put something in there

that would be what do we think is attainable. We're at 60 -- I've heard 63, 64 percent of funded status as of yesterday within the budget framework.

BOARD MEMBER HOLLINGER: Yeah, within the five years rather than -- you know. So maybe there are things that we could be -- just to give us a realistic goal to work towards that would be -- we think could be attainable.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: So let's ask Mr.

Eliopoulos. I know it's the ebb and flow. I mean, even our discussions yesterday have an impact on the portfolio, I mean the external.

BOARD MEMBER HOLLINGER: Right.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: So putting a marker out there, so to speak, as a benchmark.

Your thoughts?

CHIEF INVESTMENT OFFICER ELIOPOULOS: Speaking just as a Chief Investment Officer, sort of on the asset side of this equation, there's some -- there's some difficulty in trying to affix a number for the next five years, there's so much variability around the pattern of returns given the level of risk in the portfolio.

BOARD MEMBER HOLLINGER: That's why I thought a hundred percent just should not -- that's -- you know, we know, I mean, that it's not realistic, right.

answer from me likely would, you know, really point us to the ALM cycle, which is right in the midpoint of this five-year period, and that's where you really will be grappling with what is the level of risk, what is the current level of funded status, and what are the probabilities that we'll make actuarial progress or degrade over the five-year period.

BOARD MEMBER HOLLINGER: Okay. Thank you. CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Okay. Mr. Jelincic.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: Yeah. We have before us a '17-'18 business plan. And many of those things go beyond the year. And I can understand why they're not going to get done in a year. But what's not in the business plan is how far we get this year. You know, where should we be?

And the -- going back to an issue that Bill raised. You know, strategic plans are a work in progress. Hopefully, you know, business initiatives are not so much a work in progress, that we kind of know what we're going to do next year.

Given that you've told us they have -- you know, you're going to bring us a bunch of stuff back, I'm not sure that adoption is really the appropriate place. I think clearly you're in the right direction, you're going

the right way. You know, I would certainly feel very comfortable giving you that guidance. But, you know, actually asking us to approve the plan and the business initiative with as many holes is somewhat uncomfortable.

ENTERPRISE STRATEGY & PERFORMANCE DIVISION CHIEF HUTCHINS: So on the Business Plan Initiatives for '17-'18 our normal process would be we kind of tee these up to you as concepts. We don't completely build out all the deliverables until we make sure we have approval from you on the work that we actually want to do next year. And then that also aligns to the budget planning cycle. So usually during this time frame, we ask for approval on our Business Plan Initiative proposals, which are these; and then what the teams go back and do is actually build out our deliverables. So when you see that first report on the initiatives, you see what the expectation is for the work in that first year.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: So you're really asking for a conceptual approval? Okay.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER HOFFNER: It's a high level approval. So we're not going to do all the work and find out that's something you didn't approve and then it gets built into the budget. So you're going to get sort of another view of it.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: I understand that,

which is why so that perfectly comfortable --

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER HOFFNER: Right. So we'll do the correlation between the budget documents and the business plan. We can call them that. We've done that in the past. You're going to get two readings of the budget and you're going to see these things play out over time.

And if there's something you're objecting to or there's a concern about, I think we should talk about it. But other than that, we do have end dates in here. Many are within the '17-'18 time frame. We do have identified those that --

COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: I'm fine with those.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER HOFFNER: We've been trying to do a better job of calling those out so that you don't see them in '18-'19 time frame and say, "I thought that was a prior year item." They may have a multi-year component of it. But within that is something that we'll be working on the '17-'18 time frame.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: So, Mr. Jelincic, I
think -- you know, on one hand your point is well taken.
However, I think given this document, as Mr. Hoffner
talked about, the budget document, as Mr. Eliopoulos
talked about the ALM process, all of these go hand in
hand, and this is a con -- as I understand, this is a

document to continue moving forward. We don't lose jurisdiction over any of the issues. In fact, you will be bringing back both at the offsite -- and part of that we're going to look at some timelines.

So I just want to make sure I'm capturing this correctly.

Mr. Slaton.

COMMITTEE MEMBER SLATON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I think that -- you know, first of all, I want to make it clear, I don't have any problem with some measurements being unspecific, you know. Everything in life can't be defined down to a number, so some of them are that case.

I think in the area of fund sustainability - and I think our CIO kind of touched on this point - those are very difficult to -- you know, those are things that you can't do. You need us to make decisions that could significantly impact those -- certainly the first four on there. And so that's a function not only of what's happening on the asset side, but it's also decision making that we do on the liability side. And so I'm not sure those lend themselves for a specific target, but we can certainly talk further about that.

I think that some of us on the Board, I'm one of them, you know, short attention span. So I think one of

the important things as we go through this plan is that you -- we do as good a job as possible at telling us where we were, where we are, and where we're going. Because I lose track of particularly where we were. You know, we say here's where we are right now. And I can't remember what we said last year or last month. So I think that's important.

So with that, I think this is a great body of work and I think it has -- there's a lot still to do, and I look forward to it. And I'd like to move approval.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: All right. So we have a motion by Slaton.

VICE CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Second.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Seconded by Taylor.

Any further discussion?

All in favor?

(Ayes.)

18 CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Opposed?

Motion carries.

Thank you.

And again, Mr. Hoffner, credit to you and to Cheryl Eason. Again, building on the fact, just to reiterate, transparency award, budget awards, I know we've still got to fill some stuff in this document, but again the more information we're putting out there is very

appreciative. So thank you.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER HOFFNER: Thank you, all.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: We're going to go on to Item 7a. And I know we have Mr. Darby wants to speak.

So, Mr. Darby, you can just come on down to the front row.

But we'll just go ahead and present on 7a please.

Oh, Ms. Malm. So sorry. You're up.

OPERATIONS SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF MALM:

Thank you. Good morning, members of Finance and Administration Committee. Kim Malm, CalPERS team member. Happy Valentine's Day.

7a is an action item and it's requesting approval of the Notice of Election for the 2017 Member-at-Large Election. This election is to fill two representative positions to the CalPERS Board. They're designated as Position A and Position B.

Position A is currently filled with J.J. Jelincic and Position B is currently filled with Michael Bilbrey.

Both of the incumbents have shared their interest to rerun for election.

The election will begin on March 27th, with a distribution of the Notice of Election to CalPERS employers and retired members. The Notice of Election

will be mailed to retirees' homes -- home addresses and will be electronically sent to the employers.

The nomination petition forms must contain original signatures endorsed by at least 250 eligible active or retired CalPERS members. It must be turned in by May 18th at 5 p.m. in order for a candidate to run for election.

Eligible members include an active or retired member as of the date of the Notice of Election, which is in front of you, for March 27th, 2017.

We must be able to certify 250 members in our system for the candidate to be eligible.

Only one nomination petition may be submitted for Position A or for Position B. You cannot run for both positions.

As soon as we certify the candidates for the election, we'll send them information regarding the timeline of the remainder of the election activities, candidate guidelines, and the final candidate list.

Candidate statement booklets and ballots will be mailed to all of the actively and retired members on September 1st, and the voting will close on October 2nd.

Eligible voters will have the option to cast their vote either electronically, by phone, or by mail; and you will see a demo of that shortly in another agenda

item.

CalPERS will conduct a candidate forum, as we typically do, the first week of September. More information will follow once we get the logistics set down on that.

Paper, on-line, and telephone ballots will be tabulated, and the candidate receiving the majority vote will be certified by the Secretary of State as having been elected.

If there is no majority vote winner in the first election, then a runoff election will be conducted between the two candidates who receive the highest number of votes.

The runoff ballots will be mailed on November 10th and will be due back by December 11th of 2017.

The term of the Board members is January 16th, 2018, through January 15th of 2022.

That concludes my presentation, Mr. Chair, and I'm happy to answer any questions.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: All right. Thank you. Mr. Jelincic.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: I'm certainly not afraid of the competition. But I do notice that a retiree must be a resident of the State of California. That's not contained in Government Code 20090, nor in the reg. And

so the question is why?

And the other question is, why does it not apply to the active?

OPERATIONS SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF MALM:

It is my understanding, Mr. Jelincic, that it applies to retired and active. And although it is not specific in the PERL, it is in the Government Code section 1020. And if you'd like, I can read the -- okay?

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: I'd like to hear that.

OPERATIONS SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF MALM:

It states: "A person is incapable of holding a civil office if at the time of the election or appointment he is not 18 years of age and a citizen of the State.

"A CalPERS Board member seat is a civil office per the provisions of the Government Code section 1001, which states in pertinent part, 'The civil executive officers are persons serving on boards or commissions created under the laws of the State or established under the State Constitution

"Furthermore, Government Code section 241 states:
'The citizens of the State are persons born in the state
and residing within it or those that were born out of the
State and residing in it.'" I'm paraphrasing.

So they have to be a resident of the State in order to run for election. And when we redo our -- do

another regulation change, we can make that clear. But it is in Government Code that we follow.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: Okay. And I'm glad Jeff gave you the heads-up so you had a chance to research that. But the election

OPERATIONS SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF MALM:
I answered him.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: The election notice itself for procedures and eligibility does not apply the resident requirement to be active. And I'm just wondering if we should amend -- before we adopt it, we should amend it to make it clear that it does in fact apply to the active.

OPERATIONS SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF MALM:

The Notice of Election does not speak to the State of California for active or retired?

COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: It does for retired, but it doesn't for actives. And I'm just, you know -- and since it -- the law -- you know, non-PERL law applies to both. The election notice ought to apply to both.

There --

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: I see -- what Mr. Jelincic is saying is that in the eligibility we specifically call out the retiree and it's both retiree -- it should just say any candidate.

OPERATIONS SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF MALM:

And I'm happy to make that change right now.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: And one of the other things that I learned accidentally was that an out-of-state member, once we've made that change, may not sign a nomination paper, an endorsement. Because in order to be eligible to put your signature on the nomination petition, you have to be eligible for the office. And so one of the things that we have done now is say if you're out of state -- if you live out of state - and we have both actives and retirees who do - you can't sign a nomination petition.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: But, Mr. Jelincic, it's not us saying it. It's the statute that says it, as

Ms. Malm --

COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: Well --

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: No, I just want to make sure we're clear on this.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: Okay. It is the statute that requires you to be a resident.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Correct.

OPERATIONS SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF MALM:

To be a candidate.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: Our regs require that you be eligible per the election notice in order to sign

the nomination.

2.4

All right. I mean, now, I don't know -- I don't know how many out-of-state people would sign it, I mean.

So it --

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: I understand -OPERATIONS SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF MALM:
Sign it as one of the 250 endorsed signatures,

Mr. Jelincic, or sign it as -- to become a candidate?

COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: As one of the 250 endorsed signatures. If you're out of -- if you're out of

state -- if you're living out of state you would not be eligible to sign that nomination petition as one of the

13 250.

OPERATIONS SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF MALM:

That is not my understanding, Mr. Jelincic. But I'm happy to get some additional information from our legal team. It's my understanding that if you're an active or retired member, you get to vote. I don't -- it doesn't matter where you live.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: I think that's -- I think he's splitting the question. Is you can only be a resident to be a candidate.

OPERATIONS SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF MALM: Correct.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: And that if you're one

of -- and you have to go out and get 250 signature -- valid signatures.

OPERATIONS SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF MALM: Uh-huh.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: And what Mr. Jelincic is saying is that those 250 folks regardless of whether active or retirees have to be California residents as well. But anybody that's inside the system is eligible to vote whether they live in Nevada or California. And so --right, Mr. Jelincic?

COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: That's what he's saying, is the 250 people that sign the document must be residents of California.

And is that -- and, I'm sorry -- Ms. Taylor.

VICE CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: So we have members -- we do have members -- actually I had mine on first.

(Laughter.)

2.1

2.4

 $\label{thm:person} \mbox{VICE CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR:} \mbox{ We do have members out} \\ \mbox{of state, so we have members in Houston, Chicago, and New} \\ \mbox{York.}$ 

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: South Carolina, Tennessee, Idaho.

VICE CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Yeah. So --

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Ms. Malm, does this make

sense?

2.4

VICE CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: So representative members are actually out of state. And I would assume -- I don't know anybody who's going to travel there to get those signatures, but I would assume that if they can vote, they can sign the form.

OPERATIONS SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF MALM:

That's my understanding as well. I am trying to

find out where Mr. Jelincic got the information that the

250 have to be within state.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: It's 554.5C

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Okay. So let's do

Mr. Jones.

And what we'll do is let's just put this to the end of the agenda just to get the information.

But, Mr. Jones.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: That's what I was going to say, because that's an important distinction. Because it's my belief and my understanding that once you retire, you're eligible to sign that petition to participate in the vote. So -- that is regardless of where you live. So I think it should be clarified so people don't get a misunderstanding of that.

OPERATIONS SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF MALM: Well, they absolutely can vote. The question is

```
whether or not they can be the 250 signatures that allows you to run for a candidate.
```

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: That's correct. So if you can find out.

OPERATIONS SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF MALM:

We will do that.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: And, Mr. Darby.

I'm sorry. Any other Board members?

Okay. Mr. Darby, you have the --

Mr. DARBY: Al Darby, Vice President, Retired Public Employees Association.

This is precisely the issue I was going to speak to. I would certainly urge CalPERS to sponsor legislation that makes it possible for retirees and active members who are residing outside the State be signatories to an eligibility form as well as the actual candidate for the Board member be a person who can reside outside the State. Because we have a number of members -- I believe 14 percent of all retirees from CalPERS reside outside the State.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Okay. Thank you,

22 Mr. Darby.

Mr. DARBY: Thank you.

24 CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Ms. Malm, we'll just put

25 | this over to the last item.

Okay. Let's move on to the next item in my agenda here.

So we're going to move on to -- yeah, we're going to get the information and then we're going to bring it back at the very end of the agenda.

All right. We're going to go on to 7b.

And I can't pull this up here.

All right. The review of the delegation -- Committee's delegation authority.

INTERIM CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER TIMBERLAKE D'ADAMO: Right. Thank you.

So before you is the request and the recommendation to approve the delegation for the Finance and Administration Committee. This request comes via the governance policy which requires that the Committee actually review and approve its delegation every year.

There were some changes that were made to the delegation policy, mostly to consolidate the information and to streamline some of the information and call out the activities that the Committee has undertaken over the course of the year.

Through the review process, we have also pulled out another policy, which is a Board policy titled "The Policy for Approval of Reimbursement to State, School, and Public Agency Employers of Elected Board Members.

This policy actually requires the Finance and Administration Committee to do some work every year as it relates to the reimbursements. And so what we've done is we've taken that policy and we have put that requirement into the delegation for the Finance and Administration Committee, as well as added that requirement to the governance policy for the Board.

And in doing so, we're trying to consolidate the information in the requirements to both the delegation and the governance policy and not have a separate side policy that exists that has some criteria that the Committee has to do.

So we're requesting a rescission of the policy for the approval, because we've put that language into the delegation as well as into the governance policy; and then we're also requesting that the Committee approve the revision to the governance policy which will accept that information from that policy that we're requesting a rescission for.

And I can stop and take any questions if there are any.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: The Vice Chair.

 $\label{thm:condition} \mbox{VICE CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR:} \quad \mbox{Thank you very much for } \\ \mbox{that report.}$ 

And I know that we -- during our briefing we

talked about making sure that the policies were moved correctly, because it looked like it wasn't, I think, over to board governance that -- that you had just said that we're going to move the policy. And I guess a lot of the information that was in the policy didn't seem like it was going to get moved.

D'ADAMO: So the policy, which is the policy for approval and reimbursement, that policy, we've taken the requirement out -- the specific requirement that requires a committee to do what it's supposed to do, we've included that in the delegation in -- I want to say it's paragraph 4 as well as subsection P of the governance policy.

VICE CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Okay.

INTERIM CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER TIMBERLAKE
D'ADAMO: Then we've also separated that into the policy
and the procedure. And the procedure part of that
remains. So our process doesn't change, and we've
incorporated that procedure into our written procedures
for the team members.

VICE CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Okay. So the procedure has not changed?

INTERIM CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER TIMBERLAKE
D'ADAMO: Correct.

VICE CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: And is it over here in

1 | Finance and you're -- the procedure, or is it just a --

INTERIM CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER TIMBERLAKE

3 D'ADAMO: Yes.

4 VICE CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: -- procedure for you

5 guys?

2

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

23

24

25

INTERIM CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER TIMBERLAKE

D'ADAMO: It's -- so it's a procedure that has two basic components to it. It has the Financial Reporting and Accounting Services Division as well as some work that's done by the Board Services Unit in coordination.

VICE CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: So --

INTERIM CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER TIMBERLAKE

D'ADAMO: And that doesn't change.

VICE CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: And does it make sense to keep the procedures here in Finance And Administration, or does it make sense to move them.

INTERIM CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER TIMBERLAKE

D'ADAMO: Well, it is Finance and Administration. Meaning
that it's an internal procedure now as opposed to an

operational procedure that is part of a policy.

VICE CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Okay. That's what I
was trying --

INTERIM CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER TIMBERLAKE
D'ADAMO: So one of the things that we're trying to do is
take procedures out of policies, keep procedures internal,

67

```
1
   keep the policies as policies.
 2
             VICE CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: That's what I was
3
    trying to figure out.
             CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: The Committee will retain
 4
5
    jurisdiction over the entire issue.
6
             VICE CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Even though we're
7
   moving it over to governance?
8
             CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: The functioning aspect of
9
    the expenditure will stay here --
10
             INTERIM CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER TIMBERLAKE
   D'ADAMO: Correct.
11
12
             VICE CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Oh, oh.
13
             CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: -- as a budget.
14
             VICE CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Right, right, right,
15
   right.
16
             CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Because it's an
17
   expenditure of the fund.
18
             Other questions?
19
             VICE CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: That was my only
20
   question.
```

I was also going to move that we accept the
proposed amendments and approve the retire -- retirement
of the policy.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: So it's been moved by

25 Taylor.

But we have one more question before we get a second.

Mr. Jelincic.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: Well, in light of the motion, I will be voting no.

I approve the delegation changes, but I really have problems with taking the policy that the Board has adopted, that includes procedures on how we reimburse so people can see them, and moving them over into a staff-controlled procedure and eliminating the policy. So I -- I don't believe that staff will necessarily change any of the procedures. I mean, I'm not implying that. But I think for visibility it ought to be there. So I will vote against the motion, unless it gets split.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: All right. Mr. Jelincic, I guess the question -- so I can understand a little bit better, because I have been talking with staff regarding the process itself. I just want to make sure we're all talking about the same thing. Are you wanting the documents related to reimbursement in hours to come back to this Committee? I mean that's what -- so I can understand. Because I've actually been talking with staff again about the process ensuring that both we have the transparency you're seeking along with the -- we're working right now on what is the role of the Board

Services Unit and what is the role of Ms. Montgomery's office?

2.4

Could you articulate a little bit more so I can understand it please.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: We currently have a policy. It's attachment 4. It starts on 202 of the iPad. And that is also up on our website. And it's the policy that we have used. And it describes how the member requests, how we enter into contract with the employer, how we do invoices. So it really describes "This is how we reimburse," and it's very visible.

If we eliminate the policy, then that visibility disappears.

Now, we can have all the same procedures. But it's in a procedure manual that people don't see. And so I just think for visibility purposes, it -- we -- we should not repeal the policy. It's sort of like when we repealed the policy on the travel expenditure report before we adopted procedures on how that report was going to go. So I just think the policy ought to stay. So if we split the question, I'll vote for the changes in delegation and oppose repealing the policy. If it all goes as one vote, I will --

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Okay. So Mr. Jelincic has confused me.

We're not -- are we? Is this a policy change to way the Board members who are reim -- are we making a change in that policy as to how they complete the form, the number of hours, and how the employer submits?

INTERIM CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER TIMBERLAKE

D'ADAMO: No.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Okay.

INTERIM CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER TIMBERLAKE
D'ADAMO: So the policy that we are seeking the rescission
of is a policy which has a statement, which begins with:
"CalPERS shall reimburse a state, school, or public agency
employer of an elected Board member for the amount equal
to the salary and benefits paid to the elected Board
member based on the Board-approved percentage of the time
that will be required of the Board member to fulfill his
or her responsibilities to CalPERS in the coming year."

That language has now been or is being recommended to be deposited into the delegation, so that it is there in the delegation, as well as in the Board governance policy.

The rest of the policy, the one that we're requesting the rescission of, contains a procedure which has several steps which Mr. Jelincic is describing in terms of how that statement gets accomplished. And so what we're asking for is to put that language in the

delegation and in the governance policy so that it exists, it exists in the delegation and it also exists in the governance policy, as well take the procedure and make that an operational procedure and an internal procedure which is currently being followed. We are not changing the process.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Mr. Jelincic, does that address your concern? I mean, I will just say I've spent the last couple of weeks just trying to work through this because I was trying to strengthen process and reporting. And what I'm hearing you're saying is this is, at least in your interpretation, is a weakening of that process and a weakening of the disclosure.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: Yes, that is exactly what I'm saying. If you look at -- if you look at the motion, it says additionally retire the policy on approval of reimbursement to state and school and public agency employers of elected Board members.

And so we're -- we're getting rid of the policy. CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Okay.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: Now, the staff is assuring us that they will continue to implement what is currently policy through their procedures, which are under their control. But I think there's real value in having a Board policy that is up on the website that people can

1 look at. 2 CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Okay. 3 COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: So that's my 4 objection. 5 CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: All right. Mr. Jones. 6 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Yeah, thank you, 7 Mr. Chair. 8 Even though it appears to be minor, but I did 9 express a concern about adopting a governance policy in 10 the Finance Committee. Because if we're going to start 11 modifying policies that are governed by a different committee, and making changes in a different committee, I 12 13 think it can be confusing going forward. 14 So I know this is just one -- I guess one 15 red -- one section regarding the reimbursement, but... 16 CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Okay. Mr. Slaton. 17 COMMITTEE MEMBER SLATON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. 18 If you'll go to attachment 5, in Roman numeral 19 10, item P, "Reimbursement of Agencies Employing CalPERS 20 Board Members," it seems to be quite clear in there that 21 this is the policy of this Board as outlined in the 22 modification to the governance policy. 23 I don't have any problem with holding this piece

24

25

But I think that this raises an issue about our policies. It's a more general issue I think of -- that the separation between what we do as a board and what staff does to execute the "how it's done" is a function of management and staff. The "what we want you to accomplish" is our job as a board.

It seems to me that paragraph P clearly outlines that we're going to have a reimbursement policy for the time spent in CalPERS work.

Now, we can have discussions about the rules of the road; we can certainly do that. But the key thing is, we've outlined in policy - and this would be on the website - and I think it clearly delineates what it is we're doing in terms of reimbursement. Certainly clear enough for people to be aware that we are reimbursing agencies for elected members' work here.

So -- and I'd be fine with deferring this one to the Governance Committee in March.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: I do think we're going to put it over. But this is exactly the question,

Mr. Slaton, that you were talking about that I've been working the last couple of weeks on, because it's the second half of that question, because it will still come to Finance and Administration Committee for us to approve the time that each of those six electeds files or puts in

1 | their report.

So I think part of it is just we need to do a better job explaining, as Mr. Jelincic raised. I mean our goal is not to remove information.

So we're just going to put this item over until our April Finance Committee so we can have -- Mr. Slaton's committee can have a more robust discussion at governance. I don't see a big issue. Although I also think in the recommendation the word "retire" is probably the wrong word. So we probably need to come back with a slightly different motion.

But the second half of P will be on the April agenda anyway, is that correct, or March, about approval of time?

15 INTERIM CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER TIMBERLAKE
16 D'ADAMO: Yes.

17 CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: That's when? April 18

INTERIM CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER TIMBERLAKE

19 D'ADAMO: That occurs in April, yes.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Okay. So we'll do -- is with calendaring out. We'll do this item first and then adoption of the six members' time after we adopt this poli -- if the Board -- Committee adopts this policy.

INTERIM CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER TIMBERLAKE

25 D'ADAMO: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: All right. Any other questions on that?

Okay. Next item, 8a, which is an action item.

And Chief Actuary.

CHIEF ACTUARY TERANDO: Good afternoon,

Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee. Scott Terando,
Chief Actuary.

Item 8a is an action item. This item is the second reading of staff's consolidation of the existing Board resolutions actuarial policies and practices related to the contribution allocation.

We have reviewed the policies and we have made no material changes in the new policy.

In addition, we have made no additional changes to the first reading back in December of 2016.

With that, I'll be answering any questions you may have.

18 CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Okay. So we have two questions.

Mr. Jelincic.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: Actually, no, I have 22 two.

One is: Why are we deleting 4, which is the phasing out of the difference for people who move into the pool?

And I do not see anywhere in this policy how we decide whether people fit in the pool. I know we'd do it if you're -- got less than a hundred employees, we'd put you in the pool. But I don't see it anywhere in the policy. And maybe I just missed it or maybe we have it in some other policy.

question.

CHIEF ACTUARY TERANDO: Concerning the addition -- when members' active plan just drop below a hundred percent, that's actually in statute. And it's defined as when there's less than a hundred active members, the plans will be put into pooling. So we don't really need a policy for that.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: Okay. Thank you.

CHIEF ACTUARY TERANDO: And then your other

COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: Well, you're proposing to phase out attachment 4, which is the policy dealing with phasing out of the difference between the pools and no more class and the individual, and I didn't see where that got picked up elsewhere.

CHIEF ACTUARY TERANDO: I thought it -- it should be in the new policy.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: It should be in the new policy someplace. Okay.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: We'll get the actuary in a

77

```
1
   moment. If you could find the cite for Mr. Jelincic
 2
   please.
3
             CHIEF ACTUARY TERANDO: If you take a look at
 4
   page 4 of 7 of the policy.
5
             CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: And the pol -- which
   attachment is that in?
6
7
             CHIEF ACTUARY TERANDO: Attachment number 8.
8
             COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: Attachment 8. Okay.
9
             CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN:
                                    8A.
10
             COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: And it's in -- you
   said it's where?
11
             CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Page 4 of 7.
12
13
             COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: Page 4 of 7.
14
             CHIEF ACTUARY TERANDO: Page 4 of 7, we talk
15
    about the five-year phaseout and the difference in normal
16
    cost.
17
             COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: Okay. Thank you.
18
             That answers my question. I just didn't make the
19
   connection.
20
             Thank you.
             CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Mr. Jones.
21
22
             COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Move staff's
23
   recommendation.
2.4
             VICE CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Second.
25
             CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Mr. Slaton, your mic's on.
```

78

```
1
   You have no questions?
 2
             No questions.
3
             COMMITTEE MEMBER SLATON: Are we --
 4
             CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: We have a motion and a
5
   second.
             Do you have any questions on the motion?
6
7
             COMMITTEE MEMBER SLATON: So we're taking
8
   governance?
9
             CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: We're going to take up
10
   this 8a.
11
             COMMITTEE MEMBER SLATON: Okay.
12
             CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: I'm sorry. You had a
13
   question?
             COMMITTEE MEMBER SLATON: No, I was just making
14
15
    sure that the governance piece, we're --
16
             CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Yes. I'm sorry, yes.
                                                            Ιt
17
   was taken care of.
             Okay. Scott, anything else?
18
             CHIEF ACTUARY TERANDO: No.
19
20
             CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Okay. So we have a motion
21
   and a second.
             All those in favor?
22
23
             (Ayes.)
24
             CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Opposed?
             Motion carries.
25
```

1 Thank you.

Okay. Item 9a.

I see Forrest coming down.

All right. So before we start, time estimate on this item. How long do you think it will take to present this item?

Oh, all right. As long as we're going to take 45, okay, that's fine. I just wanted to make sure.

CHIEF RISK OFFICER GRIMES: Good afternoon. Forrest Grimes, Calpers team.

This item aligns the CalPERS Funding Risk
Mitigation Policy with direction provided during the
Finance and Administration Committee and Board discount
rate discussions that occurred in December of 2016.

And really what it does is it reduces the trigger of a funding risk mitigation event from 4 percent to 2 percent, suspends the policy for a three-year period to fiscal year 2020-21, and stipulates that member calculations would take effect immediately upon an event.

And with that, I'll be happy to answer any questions.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Okay. We have several.

Mr. Juarez.

ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER JUAREZ: Yeah. My question relates to the going down obviously to the 2

percent. And if we discussed it, I don't recall. But there must be some rationale for only adjusting the 2 percent threshold and not adjusting any of the other thresholds, recognizing that even if we wait till 2021, that's potentially going to be another time at which we will be asking, as I understand it at least, for another increase in contributions based on the mitigation policy. So I want to understand better why we're lowering the threshold from 4 percent to 2 percent and none of the other thresholds.

CHIEF RISK OFFICER GRIMES: I'm going to ask for help on this one --

ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER JUAREZ: That's fine.

CHIEF RISK OFFICER GRIMES: -- from either Ted or Scott.

CHIEF INVESTMENT OFFICER ELIOPOULOS: Get the full team back up here.

The Committee may remember that the thresholds for the risk mitigation policy originally were quite discussed, and this difference between 2 percent and 4 percent was one of the discussion points when the policy was originally adopted, at what point it would be triggered. During the course of the discussions around the discount rate change, a revisiting of the threshold occurred, and specifically thinking through, well, if we

delay it for three years, that might delay somewhat the risk reduction portion that was being -- was being hoped for, was the objective of the policy in the first part, but it would give time for the discount rate change and lowering of 50 bases points to occur at the same time. So that seemed reasonable to delay it for a number of -- for three years but not longer than that.

So I think that the threshold was just thinking through on the path of risk reduction from year 3 through 30, lets call it, that having a less of a threshold would allow for more risk reduction to occur over the course of that time frame, you know, years 4 and into the future.

ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER JUAREZ: And couple of questions. So -- first of all, so that only applied to returns that are looked at after 2021?

CHIEF INVESTMENT OFFICER ELIOPOULOS: I don't have the table in front of --

ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER JUAREZ: I'm assuming we're delaying any application that -- my assumption would be that you're only going to be looking beyond that period for whether or not you're ever going to use the risk mitigation strategy.

CHIEF OPERATING INVESTMENT OFFICER TOLLETTE:

Wylie Tollette, CalPERS staff. Yes, that's right, Mr. Juarez. The agenda item proposes suspending

```
the policy for the next three years as the already-agreed-upon discount-rate reduction occurs. So the policy will basically be put on the shelf until that three-year period is complete.
```

ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER JUAREZ: And then at 2 percent, while the risk reduction -- risk reduction strategy only generates, what is it, 0.05 percent change, that still -- will we know definitely at the time that that will require an additional contribution from employee -- employer and employee members? Or can we say that there could be mitigating circumstances that would obviate the need to do that?

CHIEF ACTUARY TERANDO: Yeah, if we were to drop the discount rate even by a basis point, there would be a corresponding increase in the employer contributions.

For the PEPRA employees, and whether that we increase, it's a slight chance it might occur but it's -- it's unique to each individual employer and whether it would hit or not.

ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER JUAREZ: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Any other questions,

Mr. Juarez?

23 ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER JUAREZ: No. Sorry. No.

24 more.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Mr. Slaton.

COMMITTEE MEMBER SLATON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I just want to go back in history, that one of the reasons for doing this was we wanted to do it in a good year. So, yes, there may be impact when the discount rate gets lowered. But at the same time we have extra gains that are being folded in. So it was kind of like divide the situation and do the risk mitigation at a time when its impact is definitely softened because you have --you have a -- it's only if it exceeds that. So you've got gain that's happening, am I correct, that's getting folded in as well?

CHIEF ACTUARY TERANDO: That is correct. With the 2 percent threshold, you know, it's likely to happen a little bit more often than the 4 percent threshold. And with the 2 percent threshold, not only does it happen a little bit more often, but the amount you'd have available to offset is a little bit less. So while there is -- you are correct that there are off -- there will be offsetting gains, and so the increase to the employers will be mitigated --

COMMITTEE MEMBER SLATON: Right.

CHIEF ACTUARY TERANDO: -- just slightly less than what it would be with the 4 percent --

COMMITTEE MEMBER SLATON: I mean, if I had my druthers, it would be, you know, 2, 5, 8, 11, and 15 would

be the numbers to be consistent with where we were to where we're going. Did you consider that?

CHIEF INVESTMENT OFFICER ELIOPOULOS: Yes. We looked at moving the other -- all of them across and thought that there were enough moving pieces to this change that we thought better to focus on that first change and try and increase the likelihood of getting, you know, some incremental five basis point changes rather than further on down. It's a judgment call. There's no science behind it for sure.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER SLATON: You got that right.
12 (Laughter.)

COMMITTEE MEMBER SLATON: With that, I would move the item.

VICE CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Second.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: We still have several questions.

Mr. Jones.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER JONES: Yeah, not that -- I
20 support the motion.

This reducing it to 2 percent lowers the threshold and hopefully will help us. We just discussed in our strategic plan a goal of a hundred percent. And so if we don't start taking some kind of action like this, we'll never get to a hundred percent. So this is

consistent with what we just talked about earlier trying to achieve a hundred percent.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Mr. Jelincic.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: The motion does three things. It suspends the policy for three years. It changes the 4 to 2. And if anybody thinks that we won't readdress that before the policy kicks in, I've got some land I'd like to sell.

And, importantly, what it does do is it changes how quickly the discount rate kicks in to the occurrence of the pricing of member benefits, the optional benefits.

Because right now there's a way of gaming the system. You ask for the benefit now, but the discount rate doesn't kick in until October. And this eliminates that. And this brings our policy -- because this is what the action the staff told us they were taking last month. So I think that's actually the most important part of it. And I will clearly support the motion.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Okay. I think that's it question-wise.

It's been moved by Slaton, seconded by Taylor.

All in favor?

(Ayes.)

2.4

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Opposed?

Motion carries. Thank you.

If there's no objection, we're going to go back to item 7a with Ms. Malm before we go to the information agenda items.

So, Ms. Malm, we'll take -- this will be our last action item.

And, Mr. Darby, if you're still here and still want to speak, you're welcome to come back up after Ms. Malm.

OPERATIONS SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF MALM: Thank you. Kim Malm, Calpers team member.

In answer to Mr. Jelincic's question, the criteria for candidates is different than the criteria for voters.

It states in section 554.5C that active and retired members shall be eligible to sign a nomination petition if he or she meets the eligibility criteria set forth in the Notice of Election for the Board member position that is subject to the election.

And what the Notice of Election states is that it's 250 active or retired members of CalPERS excluding survivors and beneficiaries. It does not say in here anywhere that they have to be a resident of California.

And, Mr. Jelincic, if you're referring to Government Code 20090, that was in the previous regulations that were updated by the Board and enacted in January. It was taken

out.

2.4

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Mr. Jelincic.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: Okay. Let me read the regulation.

554.5. Active or retired members shall be eligible to sign a nomination petition if he or she meets the eligibility criteria as set forth in the Election of Notice for the Board member position that is subject to the election. For retirees, the election notice says you must be a resident of California to be eligible.

So if you are not eligible to run, under the code of regs you can't sign it either.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: So what Mr. Jelincic is saying is the statute creates the eligibility to be a candidate, and that the class of 250 people have to meet that same eligibility requirement. The voting is different.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Okay.

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: The passage that Mr. Jelincic is talking about refers to the Notice of Election for that member who is running.

It does not say that it has to be the same qualifications of the person who is running for the

position.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

2.4

So that's the way that we read that. We think it not -- we understand there's some ambiguity there, but that's the way we read that. And I think that anything else would be legally problematic.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: I will argue there is absolutely no ambiguity in saying to be eligible to sign the nomination petition you have to meet the eligibility criteria set forth in the Notice of Election.

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: Well, I mean, and we disagree, so...

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: All right. We need to get the Notice of Election out.

So understanding the issue that Mr. Jelincic has raised, is there a motion to adopt this item?

VICE CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: I'll make the motion.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Moved by Taylor.

Seconded by --

COMMITTEE MEMBER SLATON: Second.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: -- Slaton.

Okay. All those in favor?

22 (Ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Opposed?

COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: No.

25 | CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Please note Mr. Jelincic

1 opposing the motion.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

13

14

15

16

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Thank you, Ms. Malm.

OPERATIONS SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF MALM:

4 Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: All right. Now we are moving on to information items, at 10a.

And I'll ask you the question before you start presenting, how long do you think this will be?

INTERIM CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER TIMBERLAKE

D'ADAMO: This might take about 5 to 10 minutes.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Okay. So was -- the last item was supposed to take 5 minutes.

Mr. Feckner, do we want to break for now, or how would you like to proceed?

PRESIDENT FECKNER: I have a closed session. I would like to push through.

17 CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Okay. Then we'll keep 18 going.

We have one more committee meeting after this.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Okay. Item 10a, the Quarterly Collections and Termination Report.

INTERIM CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER TIMBERLAKE
D'ADAMO: Good afternoon. Thank you, everyone for hanging
with us while we provide you with this important
information.

(Thereupon an overhead presentation was Presented as follows.)

INTERIM CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER TIMBERLAKE
D'ADAMO: This agenda item comes to you from a specific
direction of the Finance and Administration Committee
meeting at the November meeting. And the direction that
was given to the team at the time was to provide more
timely information as it relates to our employer partners
that are experiencing financial hardships.

And at that time, the Committee had specifically asked the team to provide information around transparency with respect to those employers. The Committee wanted more information regarding outreach to members whose employers might be facing financial hardship as well as specific questions or thoughts around what we can do from a legislative proposal change to help with voluntary terminations.

And so we took that feedback that was provided in November and came -- and are coming back to you with this presentation regarding the processes that we've conducted and the activities that we've done since November.

Seated to my left is Arnita Paige who is the chief for our pension contract management services, and she will co-present this item with me.

I will actually take care of slides 2 through 6,

and Arnita will do 7 and 8, and then I'll come back and do the last couple of slides.

--000--

INTERIM CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER TIMBERLAKE
D'ADAMO: Okay. So here on slide 2 we really -- given the
nature of this topic, we really think that it's important
to spend as much time as is necessary. Thank you, Chair,
for your indulgence, because this is such an important
topic.

And so what we've done is we have really created a holistic view of the employer financial health.

We have centralized the pension contract and collection functions.

We have developed a cross-divisional team for enhanced monitoring and resolution. And That's something I'll come back to as well.

An we've also strengthened the employer and member communication and education as it relates to employers who are facing financial hardships.

--000--

INTERIM CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER TIMBERLAKE D'ADAMO: On slide 3, we have listed several really important things that we have done as it relates to identifying and notifying members whose employers are facing financial hardship.

We have dedicated a developed -- we have a dedicated hotline for members to call when they receive a notice that their employer is facing financial hardship.

We have copies of our final collection and demand letters that are sent to employers. They're now also copied and sent to the members.

We also report the collection and termination status quarterly to the Board. And that's what you're seeing right now, is our commitment to provide a quarterly report to the Committee with respect to our activities.

And, lastly, we have conducted stakeholder outreach to members and employers and to employer associations for early notification.

--000--

INTERIM CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER TIMBERLAKE
D'ADAMO: We wanted to emphasize that not all terminations
end in a reduction of benefits. And so what we've
outlined on slide 4 is how some of our enhanced oversight
have led to improved outcomes.

Here we note that there were three delinquent employers that are now current and have avoided termination as a result of the active outreach and communication we've done with them.

We've also noted that there were four agencies that have successfully left the system and paid

termination costs without a benefit reduction.

--000--

INTERIM CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER TIMBERLAKE
D'ADAMO: One of the specific requests of the Committee in
November was to provide you with information regarding who
has provided us with a notice to terminate, an intention
to terminate.

And so here on slide 5 we list four agencies that have provided us with a notice to terminate. And we note that we are actively working with those agencies.

--000--

INTERIM CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER TIMBERLAKE
D'ADAMO: On slide 6 we note that since February of
2014[sic] -- and again this was another specific
request -- there were two agencies that have adopted
resolutions to terminate contracts. And again I note
we're actively working with those agencies.

--000--

INTERIM CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER TIMBERLAKE
D'ADAMO: I'll turn it over now to Arnita Paige, who will
talk to you about slides 7 and 8.

PENSION CONTRACT MANAGEMENT SERVICES CHIEF PAIGE:

Arnita Paige, CalPERS team member.

This slide represents four agencies that are significantly delinquent on their payments to CalPERS.

I'd like to point out a change in status for one,
Central Sierra Planning Council, who paid their account
current on February 7th as a result -- in result of a
final demand letter that we sent to them on January 6th.
So the account is now current.

East San Gabriel Valley Human Services. Where we are on a collection process is that we have sent them a collection notice -- final collection notice on January -- let me see -- on November 1st; and then we also followed up, on January 6th we sent them their final collect -- excuse me -- final demand letter.

And we also sent them -- on February 2nd we sent the member agencies, this is a nonact -- excuse me -- this is an inactive joint powers of authority. We sent the member agencies a letter requesting that they honor the financial obligations of East San Gabriel and pay the amounts owed and provided a response date of February 17th for them to respond.

In terms of Independent Cities Association - this is an inactive nonprofit - we sent them a final collection letter on January 6th and we followed up on January 24th with a final demand letter requesting payment. We sent the final collection and demand letter to the employer as well as the members. And they have 30 days to pay. And we are in constant communication with them.

East San Gabriel -- excuse me. Niland Sanitary
District. This is an agency that we brought to the Board
of Administration in November where they had terminated
their contract. And our next step was to perform an audit
and then a final termination valuation.

The audit is complete and we're waiting for the final report. And then the next step will be to move forward with their voluntary -- finalizing the termination.

We are in contact with this particular agency in terms of payments and discussing how they're going to pay the termination costs.

--000--

PENSION CONTRACT MANAGEMENT SERVICES CHIEF PAIGE:

On our next slide we're providing some background on these delinquent agencies. The source of information here is to the annual -- is the employer's annual valuation report reflective of 2015 data.

On the far left, starting with East San Gabriel, the plan that is delinquent is their miscellaneous plan and their formula is 2 percent at 55. It impacts 191 participants.

At a current unfunded -- excuse me. At a current unfunded accrued liability that is 7.5 percent discount rate, the liabilities are 3.3 million approximately, with

a funded status of 77.1 percent.

We also provided a possible -- a hypothetical termination amount. At a 2 percent discount rate, we're looking at a \$19 million termination and 37 percent funded. This translates for the members approximately 63 percent benefit reduction for this service under this agency.

For Independent Cities Association, their termination costs using the 2 percent discount rate is approximately \$199,000 and then again 37 percent funded.

And we're also looking at approximately 63 percent reduction for their one member.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: So I just have a question before we get to some.

So like with the Independent Cities Association, they show currently that their Chair is the Mayor of Montebello. So I would be curious -- same thing with Sierra Planning Central. And I can't find East San Gabriel Valley Human Services as an organization. I mean, it looks like they're just cutting contracts here and there.

A little bit of this accountability. So I note for the independent cities, their contact looks like it's a contractor.

PENSION CONTRACT MANAGEMENT SERVICES CHIEF PAIGE:

1 It is.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: In the 310.

So I would like for the Committee to reach out. The Chair of the Independent Cities is the mayor of Montebello, is have they responded? I mean, on their website she's front and center. They're in arrears to I just -- I don't understand -- and I -- first of all, I appreciate you all doing this, because once again we're trying to get any -- it's about accountability. But how you get -- East San Gabriel you can't find. Independent Cities Association, Inc., is I mean, it's a rhetorical question. I mean, you what? look at their -- makeup of their board of directors are all other local elected officials who are always taking shots at the organization when we talk about discount rates and benefits. Yet here are prime examples of local elected officials setting up organizations that aren't paying what they're obligated to pay CalPERS.

I mean, this is -- how do you get -- with East
San Gabriel do you get 3.3 million of accrued unfunded
liability? Who is the accounted elected official? I
mean, that's one thing I'd ask for you all to come back
with, because I do think at some point asking those
elected officials to come and explain the organizations
that they are chair of, how we've accrued this. Because I

1 will say I think it's slightly unfair both to you and to the staff of the organizations to figure out how to pay 2 3 for it. But when the mayor of Montebello, his 4 organization is in the arrears to us, and there are -- I think there are nine other elected officials on that 5 6 board, where is that accountability? Because we're got 7 again is local governments saying, you know, they didn't 8 like the discount rate, they complained from the 9 standpoint of certainty, and yet here they are in another 10 organization not meeting their obligations. So -- and 11 we're going to do some questions right now and some 12 others.

Mr. Jelincic.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

 $\label{eq:committee} \mbox{COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC:} \quad \mbox{I'm sorry, that was} \\ \mbox{from the previous one.}$ 

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Okay. Mr. Slaton.

COMMITTEE MEMBER SLATON: Thank you.

So coming back to East San Gabriel again, on the prior chart we indicated their total delinquent amount is \$406,000. And then on the next chart, the background, the annual contribution is 365. So are they a year delinquent?

PENSION CONTRACT MANAGEMENT SERVICES CHIEF PAIGE:

East San Gabriel missed their first payment in July of 2015. So they're delinquent for their '15-'16 UAL

as well as '16-'17, to answer your question.

And they are an inactive joint powers of authority and they have basically closed their headquarters office and laid off their staff and they've lost their funding. So they have not made payments since that date.

COMMITTEE MEMBER SLATON: So it says they have 93 people that are separated, but it said transferred 36. So what does the transferred -- the 36 people, where'd they go? Or do we know?

PENSION CONTRACT MANAGEMENT SERVICES CHIEF PAIGE:

I'm not sure where they -- I understand they transfer. They've left and gone -- I mean, transfer is when a member separates and goes to another for reciprocity or another -- another agency that has Calpers.

But I'm not sure in terms of where they went.

COMMITTEE MEMBER SLATON: So transfer does mean going to another agency that is --

PENSION CONTRACT MANAGEMENT SERVICES CHIEF PAIGE:

They could have gone to another agency or they have recip -- yeah, reciprocity rights somewhere.

COMMITTEE MEMBER SLATON: All right. So what's our -- when they pay, when they get invoiced they pay monthly, do they not?

PENSION CONTRACT MANAGEMENT SERVICES CHIEF PAIGE:

They do. They do pay monthly. They're required to pay monthly, correct.

COMMITTEE MEMBER SLATON: Okay. So we're now -- again, it's -- it's a similar situation to one we faced before that we're now 18 -- they're 18 months delinquent.

PENSION CONTRACT MANAGEMENT SERVICES CHIEF PAIGE:

I agree. And one of the issues with Niland was that there was an audit -- internal audit going at the same time that completed -- that was completed in October 2016. And one of the issues we're looking at is ensuring that the amounts were correct, and because of reporting issues. So after that, that's when we immediately sent the first notice in November, the final collection notice, and moved them forward in the process.

COMMITTEE MEMBER SLATON: Right. And how many cities are part of that -- this is a JPA, I assume.

PENSION CONTRACT MANAGEMENT SERVICES CHIEF PAIGE:
Right. There's four cities - West Covina, City
of Covina, Azusa, and Glendora.

COMMITTEE MEMBER SLATON: Okay. And I assume you've looked at their documents that created the JPA?

PENSION CONTRACT MANAGEMENT SERVICES CHIEF PAIGE:

Yes.

COMMITTEE MEMBER SLATON: And do they take joint and several liability for the obligations of that JPA?

PENSION CONTRACT MANAGEMENT SERVICES CHIEF PAIGE:

No, East San Gabriel is solely responsible for the liabilities.

COMMITTEE MEMBER SLATON: So that's what it says in the documents?

PENSION CONTRACT MANAGEMENT SERVICES CHIEF PAIGE:
Yes.

COMMITTEE MEMBER SLATON: Well, you know, that puts us in a rather difficult position to go back to those four agencies.

PENSION CONTRACT MANAGEMENT SERVICES CHIEF PAIGE:
That's correct.

But we had -- but we do -- I mean -- I agree.

And but we felt in a good bill of trust it was important that -- that these member agencies honor their obligation to the agencies, so we sent them a note requesting -- I mean a letter requesting that they do so.

COMMITTEE MEMBER SLATON: Yeah. It just seems like on a go-forward basis -- well, first of all, Matt, do you have a comment.

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: I do. Whether or not they have a legal obligation, our view is they have a moral and ethical obligation. They're the folks who put this thing together. And it's -- and it's their employees essentially. And just like they need to take care of

their own employees, who happen to be lucky enough to have worked directly for that city, they ought to be taken care of these folks that they've sent over to the JPA. That's why we sent the letter.

COMMITTEE MEMBER SLATON: Yeah, I totally agree. And it's just that from a documentation standpoint, you know, we're not in as good a position as we would like to be. My question is -- I assume that JPAs are being formed on a somewhat regular basis across California. And it seems to me that we should be requiring, if we're going to enter into a contract with a JPA, that the obligations that are being entered into are in effect guaranteed by the jurisdictions that are creating the JPA. And I don't think we should execute contracts unless that's a stipulation in the contract. I don't know how others feel. But it just seems to me to be a good practice so we avoid this at least in terms of new ones coming on board.

Is that something we've already contemplated or --

PENSION CONTRACT MANAGEMENT SERVICES CHIEF PAIGE:

Yes, it is. And actually we have -- from entering new contracts, we have stopped entering JPAs, those contracts. And we look -- we're also looking at, which you just mentioned, ensuring that there's a responsibility associated.

that's a great question. This is actually something that we did talk with Cheryl back, is not only were these JPAs -- when you start going back, I -- I won't tell you which large private trade association comprised of former government officials I refer to as the barnacles on the CalPERS barge, because they had gotten in the system decades ago, and I -- because I'm not quite sure, and there are -- as we go through the reports, there are numerous other organizations, not just these. There's a bookstore foundation in Southern California. There are others that at some point got into the system.

The JPAs we've been talking about are very cautious because they seem to be finding a way to remove their liabilities. It takes us a while to catch up. And then this Board is stuck with the difficult task -- like who is East San Gabriel? Who's responsible for that? I mean, not the staff. But I can't remember. Is this a city or was it part of a county? Because it looks like they had done some work with L.A. Count -- I'm sorry.

PENSION CONTRACT MANAGEMENT SERVICES CHIEF PAIGE:

They did do some work with L.A. County. I'm -well, I'm not -- I would have to get back to you on that.

COMMITTEE MEMBER SLATON: Just so I understand
the scale of the potential issue. Do we have any way of

knowing how many JPAs and therefore how many active retirees separated, et cetera? It sure would be -- I'd like to understand the scale of the problem -- or the scale of the potential problem. It doesn't mean there is one. But do we have that data? Can we get that data?

PENSION CONTRACT MANAGEMENT SERVICES CHIEF PAIGE:

Well, we -- actually staff have been looking at identifying the number of JPAs.

It's a difficult process. We do have a number and we've compared it with other sources, and we're continuing to -- but that is a population that we're looking at. We're also looking at -- it's basically what we provided here. There's a number of agencies that are inactive that we're seeing that are becoming delinquent. So we're looking at that population as well. And what I mean by inactive is an act -- they have an active contract with us, but all their plans are inactive. So we're looking at that population as well.

COMMITTEE MEMBER SLATON: Yeah, I just -- I'm wondering -- and, again, you know, you guys are the experts in this. But you have a lot of JPAs. You have stress on them, either because they've shut down or they're about to shut down or they just can't afford to pay. And it seems to me that maybe there's an ability to proactively go out to our cities or counties, who are

participants in JPAs, to give them notice now that we're going to hold them accountable.

PENSION CONTRACT MANAGEMENT SERVICES CHIEF PAIGE:

That's a good question, and I think it segues into the next steps we'll talk a little bit more about what we're doing.

COMMITTEE MEMBER SLATON: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: And I would like -- and we'll call on Ms. Taylor and Mr. Jelincic. But back to like the Independent Cities Association, not to create more work for you all, but they're the exact type of folks that every one of those local electeds should be copied on the letter that you sent. There are 11 -- this organization, every JPA, either they don't know about it, so it's a bit of an embarrassment to find out about it, or they've been complacent in the fact that the obligations aren't being paid to us. So that's just something I know to look at. But just looking at these 11, so...

MS. TAYLOR.

VICE CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: So is this -- I've only been on the Board two years. Is this a new phenomena that we're having these delinquent agencies all of a sudden?

PENSION CONTRACT MANAGEMENT SERVICES CHIEF PAIGE:

Well, we have ongoing delinquent agencies. But I think in the case of agencies that are unable to come

before the Board because they're at risk for possible potential termination, with Loyalton being our first one reduction, we're starting to see more.

VICE CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: So then this begs this other question I had, because I watching Mr. Costigan do research right off the bat. Are -- aside from sending letters, do you have a staff that's actually doing the collection process?

PENSION CONTRACT MANAGEMENT SERVICES CHIEF PAIGE:

We do. We have in -- the collections team moves to the pension contract team in September. So staff, we are talking to these employers as well as the member agencies, absolutely.

VICE CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: And you've looked in -you've done the research and found that like City of San
Gabriel, or whatever that was --

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: East San Gabriel.

VICE CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: -- East San Gabriel, actually the head of it is a mayor in a different city and --

PENSION CONTRACT MANAGEMENT SERVICES CHIEF PAIGE:

That information we did not take into consideration. I think that where we are now in the maturity of the process, we're definitely looking at the joint powers authority and working with the member

agencies and doing our best to promote accountability.

But I'll definitely take that back.

VICE CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: I mean, I think that's part of what you look at.

PENSION CONTRACT MANAGEMENT SERVICES CHIEF PAIGE: Absolutely.

INTERIM CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER TIMBERLAKE

D'ADAMO: Can I say something?

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Yes, please.

INTERIM CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER TIMBERLAKE
D'ADAMO: So one of the things I think that we wanted to
bring to your attention is the process that we have been
undergoing in the last few months regarding the
collections and terminations. I had mentioned the
contract management team. And so as part of the last
slide that we'll get to we have put -- brought together
this team which consists of senior members from the
Actuarial Office, from the Legal Office, from Stakeholder
Relations, from the Financial Office; and really what
we're doing there is we're escalating -- once an employer
partner gets to be delinquent, we're escalating to that
team where we're then cross-divisionally working to try to

To revisit sort of the conversation that we've had around what we have been doing, we have actually

see what we can do to mitigate that circumstance.

engaged our audit group to go out and do audits of a lot of the inactives that we've been talking about. And really what we're trying to do is we're trying to create a pipeline and really bucket in terms of the employer partners the situations that we find so that we can then put risk mitigation strategies around them.

So what you'll see in the coming months is really a -- a really large effort around identifying these employer partners around developing processes to help mitigate circumstances that they might find, and really identifying and reaching out to them early on, I think as Mr. Slaton had mentioned, so that everyone is aware of where we are at and what our intentions are so that we can meet expectations.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Mr. Jelincic.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: Yeah. I just want to reference to slide 5. You don't have to go there. But that's Herald Fire, who's one of the people who gave us a notice of intent, is in the press saying, "Well, gee, we can't get our termination." And I don't think that's true.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Anything else,

Mr. Jelincic?

2.4

COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: No.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Ms. Paquin.

ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER PAQUIN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I assume we're going to get to this in the next slide, Marlene. But I was curious, when you talk about legislative strategy, is that something that you plan to pursue this year, and what would that entail?

INTERIM CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER TIMBERLAKE
D'ADAMO: Actually what we have been told is that 2018
would be the first time that we would be able to pursue
something. And this would be around the voluntary
termination process.

ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER PAQUIN: Okay. Do you have a little bit more detail about that yet?

INTERIM CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER TIMBERLAKE
D'ADAMO: Well, I think what we were talking about was for voluntary terminations there is a mechanism where once you provide an intent to terminate or you go through a process, you have to actually wait a year before you can actually terminate. So we're looking -- we're looking to try to find a way that we can shorten that so that there isn't that requirement to actually wait an entire year.

ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER PAQUIN: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Okay. You want to go to your next slide.

And then here's just schedule-wise, what we're going to do is we're going to finish this item, then we're going to break for lunch.

About 40 minutes, Mr. Feckner, for a lunch break?

About 40 minutes. And then we will come back,

wrap up. I think we'll have two items left. And then we

will take a short break and then go to PERF and Comp.

So let's go ahead and wrap up this item.

INTERIM CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER TIMBERLAKE
D'ADAMO: Sure. So slide 9, which is upon the screen, is
really just a description of what I've been talking about
in terms of the processes and the protocols that we are
actively pursuing in order to develop a process and able
to get that to you. Or I should say, not develop, but
document the process for you in a quarterly report.

So I talked about audit. How we have audit looking at it.

Segment the populations into risk categories, which I talked about.

And develop and implementing risk mitigation strategies.

The legislative proposals, we talked about.

And then we were -- our intention is to come back to you in May with an update on progress that we've made since then.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: All right. And I think great strategy. I think the legislation, I think as Mr. Slaton raised, it might be shrinked to 12 months.

But I do think one -- again not to pile on additional work. But in many of these it's because you have local electeds. And we have to look at them from two sides. On one, again picking on the mayor of Montebello, she's got her employees and so she's got an independent relationship with CalPERS, and getting billed by actuaries and all that. And then she's over here as the chairman of this other organization. And so we need to elevate both because they play. Failure to pay -- any of these organizations to pay impacts the other position as well.

And so I'm just saying from a process standpoint, talking to the executive director is fine. You may want to start CC'g the electeds so that they know what's going on, because that is the next elevation just as

Mr. Jelincic raised. Someone taking a shot at us in the press. Go back and go take a look at it. Because these type of documents, how you get 18 months behind. And I understand we're working on our process. But they knew on their end as well. I'm sure every month they kept wondering is the check coming or not, because they knew they weren't paying. So...

Anything else on this item?

INTERIM CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER TIMBERLAKE
D'ADAMO: Well, the last slide I just wanted to highlight
for you, is actually we've provided a timeline for the
collection process. And so what we really wanted to point
out was that at day 31 an account is considered delinquent
if the payment hasn't been received. And by day 36 they
start getting -- the employers start getting collection
calls and notices from our system.

At day 60, a final collection letter is sent giving them 10 days to pay. And at this point the members receive notification of that letter. So we're really trying to engage the members early on so that they can actually be aware of it and put some pressure on if they can.

At day 91 we send a final demand letter, which has 30 days to pay. And again at day 31 members are notified of the status and the risk of a possible termination.

And then at day 92 the agency is elevated to our contract management team, which is what I spoke of before. That's our cross-divisional group where we are actively engaging with those agencies to find a good resolution to the situation.

So we thought it would be helpful to provide you with this timeline so that you can actually see some of

the things that we've been doing.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: What happens after day 92?

INTERIM CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER TIMBERLAKE

4 D'ADAMO: I'm sorry?

5 CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: What happens after day 92?

6 INTERIM CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER TIMBERLAKE

D'ADAMO: Well, at that point then it goes to our contract management team, where we're actively discussing what are the next steps. So, for instance, in East San Gabriel, one of the things that came out of that was to send the demand letter to the employer members. So we'd sent the demand letter to East San Gabriel, we sent it to the members — the members. But then we also sent it to the employer members. And now we've sent it to them and we're awaiting some sort of response from them.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: So from day 1 to what day would this Committee see an action item? So assume that it's day 93, 30-day notice, they don't pay. Okay. So now we're five months removed from our initial letter. When would this Committee see it in the timeline?

INTERIM CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER TIMBERLAKE
D'ADAMO: So it probably depends on what the specific
circumstances are of the agency. But at day 92, that is
when we start actively talking about what are the next
steps and if there is a step that can be implemented prior

to the recommendation to terminate. That of course is the last step.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Okay. So we're working on a timeline for when this Board -- this Committee would be notified and then -- again, it sounds though it just hangs out after day 92. I know there's more that could be that goes on. But I think process and timelines are important. So at day 150 if no payment has been received it gets calendared for this Committee for action.

INTERIM CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER TIMBERLAKE D'ADAMO: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: I mean that's I -- I would like staff to bring a recommendation back to the Committee. But I don't see what happens -- so you're going to have a conversation, they still don't pay.

PENSION CONTRACT MANAGEMENT SERVICES CHIEF PAIGE:

Correct. And part of -- in November is part of our collection and termination process. The next step at day -- when the final demand letter, the next step is we -- when all -- we double check all avenues, would be agenda item for termination if that's what the Committee decides.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Great.

INTERIM CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER TIMBERLAKE

25 D'ADAMO: And in fact in the final demand letter we

```
1
    indicate that the next step is termination.
 2
             PENSION CONTRACT MANAGEMENT SERVICES CHIEF PAIGE:
 3
             Correct.
             CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Any other questions?
 4
             If not, we are going to adjourn until 1:45 for
 5
 6
    lunch and then come back. And I think we'll go about --
 7
    I'm sorry, recess. Sorry. Thank you -- 30 more minutes
 8
    of time, right?
9
             INTERIM CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER TIMBERLAKE
10
    D'ADAMO:
11
             Probably -- not more than that.
12
             CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Great. Thank you.
13
             (Off record: 1:10 p.m.)
14
             (Thereupon a lunch break was taken.)
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

AFTERNOON SESSION

2 (On record: 1:44 p.m.)

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: All right. We're going to reconvene. We're going to take up Item 10b, which is voting options.

I believe, Ms. Malm, this is your item.

(Thereupon an overhead presentation was Presented as follows.)

OPERATIONS SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF MALM:

Okay. Good afternoon, members of the Finance and Administration Committee. Kim Malm, CalPERS team member. With me today I have Dallas Stone, the assistant division chief of operations. This is his first time at the speakers table.

Welcome to Succession Planning.

(Laughter.)

OPERATIONS SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF MALM:

Agenda Item 10b is an information item to provide the Board with an update on the development of the new Board election voting options and to provide a demonstration of the online and telephone voting systems.

For the past three years we have been on this journey to change the Board election process to include online and telephone voting, with a goal to increase voter participation. In order to do this we knew that we'd have

to develop a system that would entice our members to vote.

Adding online and telephone voting in addition to the current paper ballot we believe will accomplish this goal.

--000--

OPERATIONS SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF MALM:

To recap the last few years, in 2014 the Board approved the addition of online and telephone voting.

Once it was approved by the Board, we updated the Board election regulations to include these new voting options.

We worked closely in 2015 with the Secretary of State so that they would continue to certify our Board election results with the new voting options.

In 2016, CalPERS procured the new Board election vendor and awarded the contract to IVS / Everyone Counts.

Changes to the Board election regulations became effective last month, in January 1st, and the new voting options will be used for the upcoming 2017 Member-at-Large election.

--000--

OPERATIONS SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF MALM:

When designing the system, securing our members' information was our number one priority. Based on best practices, members will receive a randomly generated eight-digit PIN in their candidate statement booklet, and

use a unique identifier which is the last four digits of their Social Security number to log on to the system to vote.

--000--

OPERATIONS SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF MALM:

The new voting options are convenient, secure, and easy to use. The voting system is designed to give the voters the flexibility to use their laptop, tablet or smartphone.

At this time we'd like to demo the online and telephone voting systems. These systems are prototypes and are still in the final development stages. We'll walk you through each screen of the online voting system and then play for you a demonstration of a successful and an unsuccessful phone vote.

--000--

OPERATIONS SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF MALM:
So this next screen Dallas will get you to. This
is the screen that the voters will see once they type in
the URL from the candidate statement booklet - there we
go - or click on the link from the Calpers website. This
is the front page.

They will type in their eight-digit PIN that is assigned by the vendor to them and only them. It will be in their candidate statement. They will then type in the

eight digits -- or, sorry -- the four digits of their Social Security number. As you can see, if you don't put in -- if you put in less than eight digits for the PIN or less tan four digits for the Social Security number, the log-in on the bottom is grayed out.

So go ahead and put in the eight. Now you see a check mark next to PIN. And when Dallas puts in the four, you'll see a check mark. And now log-in is blue.

Click on the log-in in order to continue. On the left-hand side you'll see a summary of your actions.

You would click to start voting, the "start voting" on the bottom right, for position A. You will see the candidate statements that will be listed to the right of the candidate's name. You can click on the candidate statement in order to read their statement right there on line, and then go back by using the "return to position" button.

The order of the candidates will be the order on the ballot, which is done via random drawing on June 6th.

Now, let's go ahead and try and vote. Select the box to vote. You'll see that if you try to select the second box, it will not allow you to do so. You would have to unclick the first box in order to click a different box.

Now, hit "next position" down at the bottom. And

you would be moving to position B.

So let's vote for A and B so we can see how to do it correctly. Now press "vote summary," and you will see that you will get a summary of your voting of the two positions and who you voted for. You would hit "submit" at this point to be done.

But let's go back and let's not select somebody for position B and hit "vote summary." You'll notice that you will get an "error" message letting you know that you have not voted for someone in position B.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: I'm sorry. You have to vote for someone?

OPERATIONS SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF MALM:

You do not have to vote for a position B. But it will give you an "error" message so that -- to make sure that you realize that you have not done so.

But you could go ahead and see the "error" message and hit "submit" if you wanted to.

Let's go ahead and go back in and change the selection, select one, and say "vote summary."

So once you say yes and you hit "submit," you will not be able to go back and vote again. Once your PIN number is used, you cannot do a phone vote or a mail paper ballot. The first vote that is received is the only vote that will count.

And there's your "congratulations" screen. So it was about four slides.

I'm going to stop here and ask if there's any questions on the online demo before we move to the phone.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Mr. Jelincic.

2.4

COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: Looking at the "error" message if you didn't vote, I think you may want the change that message somewhat, because it really implies that you kind of have to vote, although that's not the intent.

OPERATIONS SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF MALM: Okay.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: And the other thing is you talked about a unique identifier, which was the last four digits of your Social Security number, and you can't get a million unique numbers out of four digits.

So --

OPERATIONS SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF MALM:

That's why they also receive the eight-digit
randomly generated number.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: But you had described the last four digits as a unique identifier.

OPERATIONS SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF MALM: Unique to them.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: But it's not.

OPERATIONS SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF MALM: 1 Okay. So we will look at the "error" message, 2 3 Mr. Jelincic. 4 COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: Okay. Thank you. 5 CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Mr. Feckner. 6 PRESIDENT FECKNER: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chair. 7 want to say it's been a long time coming. I really like 8 and appreciate all the work that's gone into it, and 9 hopefully this will increase our voter participation. So 10 thank you and your team for all the hard work. OPERATIONS SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF MALM: 11 12 Thank you. Thank you to the Board for your 13 direction in allowing us to do this. 14 So let's go --15 CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Mr. Bilbrey. 16 BOARD MEMBER BILBREY: Just a quick question. 17 So will you go over a little bit about what 18 happens if someone does try to do a paper ballot or a 19 phone ballot after they've already done say the online. 20 What, do they get some sort of message or --

OPERATIONS SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF MALM:

They will not get a letter that says that they've already voted one time. However, if they are on the phone, you'll hear an unsuccessful attempt, that if they voted once before, it won't let them. If they try -- if

21

22

23

24

25

they -- if we've received their paper ballot and they try and go and vote online, it will reject it as well. It will not allow you to log on and --

2.4

BOARD MEMBER BILBREY: And if they voted online and received the paper ballot, what hap -- how does it --

We would discard the -- we would not count the paper ballot.

BOARD MEMBER BILBREY: So when you look at the paper ballot, then there's nothing --

OPERATIONS SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF MALM:

OPERATIONS SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF MALM:

It would -- they'd scan it in -- the vendor would scan it in, see that that has already been a unique identifier and the eight-digit randomly generated number was already used, and they would not count that paper ballot.

BOARD MEMBER BILBREY: Okay. Thank you.

OPERATIONS SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF MALM:

Okay. So we're going to go ahead and listen to a successful attempt on the -- on the telephone. And this does take a couple of minutes. But I thought -- we thought it was important for you to hear what happens when people do a telephone vote.

(Thereupon Member-at-Large election recording demonstration.)

MODERATOR: "Welcome to the 2017 Calpers Board of Administration Member-at-Large Election. The purpose of this election is to elect two representative seats, position A and position B, to the Calpers Board.

"To log into the system, you will need to enter your PIN and the last four digits of your Social Security number. Please enter your PIN followed by the pound key.

"Now enter the last four digits of your Social Security number followed by the pound key.

"You are now successfully logged into the election.

"Positions are in the order as shown on the paper ballot. To hear the candidates for position A, press 8.

To repeat these instructions, press 1. You can access a menu of additional options at any time by pressing the star key.

"You are now selecting candidates for position A and will choose from five candidates which are listed in the same order as shown in the paper ballot. To hear the first candidate, press 8. To repeat these instructions, press 1.

"John Doe. To select this candidate, press 5.

To hear more about this candidate, press 3. To move down to the next candidate, press 8. To move up to the previous candidate, press 2. To hear these instructions

again, press 1.

"John Doe is selected. Press the pound key to save your selection. To move down through the list of candidates, press 8. To move up through the list of candidates, press 2. To change your selections to the current position, press 5. To repeat these instructions, press 1.

"You have chosen to save your selections.

"To continue to position B, press 5. If you wish to go back and change your selection, press 2. To repeat your selections, press 1.

"You are now selecting candidates for position B and will choose from two candidates which are listed in the same order as shown on the paper ballot. To hear the first candidate, press 8. To repeat these instructions, press 1.

"James Stewart. To select this candidate, press 5. To hear more about this candidate, press 3. To move down to the next candidate, press 8. To move up to the previous candidate, press 2. To hear these instructions again, press 1.

"Callie Grace. To select this candidate, press 5. To hear more about this candidate, press 3. To move down to the next candidate, press 8. To move up to the previous candidate, press 2. To hear these instructions

again, press 1.

"Callie Grace is selected. Press the pound key to save your selection. To move down through the list of candidates, press 8. To move up through the list of candidates, press 2.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: All right. I think we have it.

So I do have a question for you.

OPERATIONS SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF MALM:

We were trying to get to the confirm. But yes.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Why was the decision made, rather than say here are the five candidates, you know, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, why is it you're rolling through? Because first placement actually does pretty well on this one, fifth placement, if you have multiple -- I mean, what was the decision not to hear everybody's name and go first?

OPERATIONS SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF MALM:

I'm going to phone a friend.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Okay. That's fine. Is that push number 1?

We'll get number 2 --

VICE CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Is that your life line?

OPERATIONS SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF MALM:

That's my life line.

Introduce yourself.

MS. CHARLESTON: Hello. My name is Dani
Charleston and I am the project manager with Everyone
Counts. We -- so the reasoning behind the number scheme
that you see on the online -- or the paper -- my goodness,
I'm nervous up here --

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Telephone.

-- with the phone demonstration is because it is meant to mock an actual paper ballot. There's been a lot of research on how to have an IVR system work for voters with disabilities. And so the moving up is with the 2, moving down with the 8, and selecting with the 5 is set to mirror how you would move through paper ballot if you were a visual voter.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Okay. But what I'm -- I guess the question I'm asking is, I dial in, and if there are five people on it, why did we just not -- I get the decision of moving down on it. But why don't we have, for position A, here are the following five candidates, boom, boom, boom, boom, boom, boom.

Candidate Theresa Taylor, press 1, right, and then go through that -- you don't -- if I want to vote for candidate 5 where I don't have the paper ballot in front of me, I have to go -- I want to know where in the position that's going to be. I'm just trying to understand what the policy was. You cut everybody -- you

immediately jump to candidate 1 as opposed to defining the field. Because on the ballot I can look and I can see everybody. I can still move down the same way. What was the rationale for not doing that?

MS. CHARLESTON: So the rationale is that the research was based upon IVR specifically for elections. We looked at different organizations within the United States and a lot within Australia as well that looked at how to best do IVR for voting.

We do have the option to -- there's some flexibility with the recording. So if you wanted when they present the first position, we could read all candidates and then state that they would be read in that particular order moving down vertically. It would still be the move back up with the 2, move down with the 8, select with the 5, but we could put a recording at the very beginning of that position that states, "These are your five candidates. Be prepared to hear them as listed vertically on a ballot."

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Okay. Because I mean, I'd be curious -- because part of it, let's say if we get Donna Jones and Henry Jones and I get them confused, oh, it's B -- candidate B versus -- I mean -- I'm just saying, the visual, I get it. It's just we jump to it.

But are there other questions or anybody else has

129

```
1
    issues with this?
 2
             Okay.
 3
             OPERATIONS SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF MALM:
 4
             We can -- we can --
5
             CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Go to the -- let's hear
6
    the not successful one.
7
             OPERATIONS SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF MALM:
8
             Okay.
9
             (Thereupon Member-at-Large election recording
10
             demonstration.)
             MODERATOR: "Welcome to the 2017 Calpers Board of
11
12
   Administration Member-at-Large Election. The purpose of
13
    this election is to elect two representative seats,
14
   position A and position B, To the CalPERS Board.
15
             "To log into the system you will need to enter
16
    your PIN and the last four digits of your Social Security
17
             Please enter your PIN followed by the pound key.
18
             "A vote has already been registered for this PIN.
19
    To be transferred to the election call center, please
20
   press 0."
21
             VICE CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Are you going to have a
    call center.
22
23
             OPERATIONS SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF MALM:
2.4
             I will answer that question.
25
             VICE CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Thank you.
```

OPERATIONS SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF MALM:

So that's the unsuccessful. You can hear what happens if they've tried to do it again.

And also, as you can see on the screen, paper ballot is still being available for the election.

Okay. If you have any issues, there is a 1-800 number that will be manned 24/7 by the IVS/Everyone Counts team. If it's policy or procedure related, like something that our Board election coordinator should answer, they will transfer them to our 800 number. However, if it's something on like I can't find my PIN or my eight-digit number or I need help navigating through the system, then the 1-800 number that's manned 24/7 will be handling those calls.

VICE CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: So I want tell you how much I appreciate this. I think that this will spur voting. I think that you guys have done a great job.

I will say that I think -- I agree with Richard in that as a visual voter, at least me who votes at the ballot, I see all of the names and then -- and maybe I already know who I want to vote for and maybe I don't, but some -- and sometimes I don't, right. So I need to see all the names. So I'm thinking maybe we should hear all those names first and then go down.

OPERATIONS SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF MALM:

And we can do that at the beginning. But as

Dallas just pointed out, after we go through those we want

the names individual because their candidate statement has

been tied to that individual after that.

2.4

VICE CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: Absolutely agree. I agree. Absolutely I agree with that.

But again I do want to compliment you all on making this happen. And I'm hoping that we see an increase in participation. I think that's our biggest goal here.

OPERATIONS SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF MALM: So do we.

VICE CHAIRPERSON TAYLOR: All right. Thank you. OPERATIONS SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF MALM:

So, finally, in order to enhance and entice CalPERS members to vote, we partnered with Public Affairs and we rebranded the candidate statement booklet, the envelope and the ballot card. The booklet will provide more clarity regarding the role of the Board, the new voting options with online being the recommended choice, as well as five questions that we recommended the candidates answer.

--000--

OPERATIONS SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF MALM:
This last slide is an example of the rebranded

packet that all members will receive in September to vote.

If I may, Mr. Chair, I would like to appreciate and congratulate Mr. Stone, the OSSD Board Election team, Public Affairs, IT, and the IVS / Everyone Counts for working so hard together as a team to make this a reality.

They've rebranded, like I stated, the candidate's statement package, the ballot, the envelope; they've updated regulations; they've developed and designed the online voting website, the verbiage for two phone options, and all made it a reality for today's presentation.

We had some really great feedback from our members at the CalPERS Education Fair in Sacramento last week regarding the Board's direction to move to online voting. And Dallas and I have been requested to go and attend some meetings for the Cal retirees, CSEA, California Faculty Association, and the California Association of Professional Scientists to demo the new election. And so we're looking forward to sharing that so that we can help increase the vote.

This concludes my presentation, and Dallas is happy to answer any questions you may have.

(Laughter.)

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: I just wonder who's going to take Dallas's place for everybody that calls needing a little special attention.

1 (Laughter.) CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Ms. Hagen. 2 ACTING BOARD MEMBER HAGEN: Thank you. I just 3 4 want to congratulate you two. It's a very cool system I like a lot. 5 6 I did have one question. Are there any plans for 7 LEP, limited English proficiency, callers? Can they dial a number and get something translated or --8 9 OPERATIONS SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF MALM: 10 Not at this time, any more than we offered that 11 previously with the online ballot -- I'm sorry -- with the 12 paper ballot. 13 ACTING BOARD MEMBER HAGEN: Okay. Thank you. 14 CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Okay. Any other 15 questions? And this was an information item. So thank you 16 17 very much. 18 OPERATIONS SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF MALM: 19 Thank you. 20 CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: All right. Next item, It's also an information item. This is a 21 10c. 22 responsible contractor as it applies to other CalPERS 23 contracts.

OPERATIONS SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF MALM:

So, Ms. Malm, back to you.

2.4

25

Okay. At the December 2016 Investment Committee meeting the Board requested we provide information and background on the application of the Responsible Contractor Policy at the February 2017 Finance and Administration Committee.

It was requested in an effort to ascertain whether the policy's appropriate for the rest of CalPERS contracts. The RCP Policy currently applies to all contracts in real estate and infrastructure investments in which CalPERS owns at least 50 percent majority of these companies.

CalPERS maintains contracting policies and processes that align with state contracting laws and regulations as prescribed in the Public Contract Code, Government Code, Military and Veterans Code, the State Administrative Manual, and the State Contracting Manual.

Changes to these standards and practices of CalPERS contracting activity similar to those embedded in the RCP policy would require legislative changes to existing contracting law and procedures utilized by all California state agencies. Additionally, enforcement of this policy without legislative and/or regulatory changes could be considered as imposing an underground regulation.

State contracting law outlines specific terms and conditions required for all State contracts. As such,

CalPERS 33-page contract template contains 77 standard terms and conditions not counting the specific IT and investment terms.

Of those 77 terms and conditions, eight directly support fair employment practices and ideals adopted by labor unions, as well as encourage development of small business and disabled veterans business.

CalPERS is dedicated to promoting lawful behavior and decency with respect to workers employed by CalPERS contractors and subcontractors, and believes an adequately compensated and trained worker delivers higher quality product and service and therefore incorporates the following eight terms, which are in your attachment 1, into every contract:

Sweatfree Code of Conduct,

Benefits for Domestic Partners,

Child Support Compliance Act,

Nondiscrimination,

National Labor Relations Board Certification,

Americans with Disabilities Act,

Drug-Free Workplace, and

Small Business and Disabled Veteran Business

Enterprise Participation Goal.

In addition to these provisions, CalPERS always

25 remains neutral in regards to employee's right to organize

at the their place of employment.

Implementation elements of the RCP Policy for all CalPERS contracts would require collaboration with multiple program areas, including Legal, Investments, Enterprise Compliance, Human Resources, Operations, and the Board of Administration.

Multiple considerations would need to be taken, including:

What would the parameters of the program be?
Would they be required on all contracts or just some?
Would there be a dollar threshold?

Who would be responsible for monitoring program compliance?

Would the RCP continue to be reported to the Board on an annual basis? If so, who would be responsible for gathering and presenting this data?

And how would complaints and investigations be handled?

The practicality and method of extending this policy in the future beyond only majority-owned real estate and infrastructure investments depends on the factors and considerations described.

If it pleases the Committee, I have some information on our janitorial and our cafe workers and security staff here at CalPERS, because the Board is very

supportive of ensuring fair pay for our workers. And this is primarily what this -- this RCP Policy was written for.

And so I'd just like to share that, you know, currently our janitorial staff make an average of 17.05 per hour. They have a special rider in the BOMA contract, which is 51.56 percent more than the rest of Sacramento. It just is a testament to the CalPERS Board and their belief in fair wages and pay for staff.

Cafe staff are subject to SB 19134, which means that they must make at least 85 percent of the State's salary and benefits for the same classification. The average pay for a cafe worker is \$11.38 an hour. However, with their benefits it is \$18.86 to \$21.76 per hour based on the number of dependents. They receive medical, sick pay, vacation pay, holiday pay, and pension.

And for the security staff, they're also subject to SB 19134, and their hourly rate is \$11.34 per hour. With benefits, they average \$18.80 to \$23.52 based upon their number of dependents. They also receive medical, sick pay, vacation pay, holiday pay, and 401 matching. We're really proud of those numbers.

This concludes my information that was requested on the Responsible Contractor Policy for all CalPERS contracts, and I'm happy to answer any questions.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Mr. Juarez.

ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER JUAREZ: Yes, thank you, Kim, and also thank you, Doug. I had a chance to speak with Kim and Doug yesterday a little bit about what our intent was in asking for this information.

The genesis of it comes from a complaint that we heard about the -- on the issue of neutrality over collective bargaining agreements, which isn't part of your eight, and feeling as though while we have a great regard, and it's stated in the -- up front in the policies as it relates to Calpers employees or those who may be employed within a Calpers-owned building, it wouldn't seem at least with regard to neutrality on collective bargaining that we hold those employees that are affected in the same regard.

And for that reason, I believe that it's worth exploring further and having the staff come back to us. And quite frankly, I was enthralled with the questions. I thought they were very good questions. But I sort of, in my experience, I leave it to the staff to sort of define what would be doable without too much administrative burden in order to get this accomplished. And, again, I'm going to focus only at this point on the neutrality issue. There may be other issues that Board members want to put forward relative to extending those to all our contracts. But I do believe that it does make sense to at least for us -- it does make sense for us to at least consider that.

Again, I think the staff has done good work here, but I think there's much more to be done. I would hope that this excellent start will not deter us from taking a look at it, whether it's through regulation, through legislation. I realize those are steps that may need to be taken. But I want to encourage you, Kim and Doug and others, to at least consider coming back to us with sort of a how-to, less so about what to do, but how could we go about doing this, what would be the cost, what would be the administrative burden that we would incur in order to do this. I just think it's -- if we're going to treat our own employees in such a fashion -- and again I'm going to focus just on neutrality -- we should extend that to other contract -- employees that by virtue of their employment are essentially indirect employees of ours.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I would also hold to the point that while it's said that we do it in real estate because we have a leverage, being an owner, I would say we have equal or almost equal leverage with regard to being an owner of that contract. If someone that we're doing business with realizes that one of the terms that they have to meet is being neutral in collecting bargaining situations, and they choose not to do so, they have to know that we would be willing to pull that contract in order to enforce that provision.

And so with that, I'll stop there and leave it to the rest of the Board. But I would seriously like the staff to come back to us with a more concrete idea of how-to.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: I just want to make sure I understand it. You want to pursue any contract for services?

ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER JUAREZ: I would say -CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Could I get -- I'm sorry.

ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER JUAREZ: Yeah. I'm
sorry, I thought you were done.

With for cell phones, for example, for our cellular service, the large company in California that currently engages with its workers, a condition of our -- I just want to make sure I understand what we'd be proposing is a condition of contracting with them for cell phone services is that their management would have to commit to neutrality of collective bargaining?

ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER JUAREZ: In the same way that they commit to the other eight provisions that we routinely put in our contracts, I would say yes. I would leave it to the staff. If staff says that there are areas in which we provide exemptions, that we choose not to enforce it for say high level employees that are actuarial

services, legal services, whatever it may be, I'm going to put it on staff to say, "We don't think it's appropriate in these instances to have that provision." But I'm just saying, just in the same way that we apply the other eight, why can't we apply neutrality in collective bargaining negotiations as one of those things that we hold people to as a standard.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Mr. Hoffner.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER HOFFNER: I was just going to point out that the things that Kim reference are actually all statutory changes and requirements of all contracts in the Public Contract Code for the State of California. So hearing the conversation and statements, those all still relate to change of law. So I think --

ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER JUAREZ: And as I said in my remarks, I think if it means that we have to go to the legislature, I think that should be something we should consider.

OPERATIONS SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF MALM:

If I may, would you consider -- I know that in the past that Investment Office has made a phone call to a manager when they believe that they needed to, you know, step in. There wasn't anything formal in the contract terminology, or terms and conditions. But they have made a phone call and, you know, placed pressure on that by

making that phone call. We do have a termination clause in every contract where if they're not doing something that we believe is fair and right, that we could terminate without any cause in 10 days.

Would you consider staff managing that in that way as opposed to --

ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER JUAREZ: I would. But I would hope that it wouldn't get into a situation where somebody on the other end of that line says, "Well, you've never told us that we were held accountable for that."

OPERATIONS SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF MALM: Okay.

ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER JUAREZ: But I certainly leave to you, to the CalPERS staff, to determine for us what would be the appropriate way in which we chose to enforce that provision. I'm not speci -- I'm not trying to be as -- as least specific as possible to allow you to tell us the most reasonable way to proceed.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: So, Mr. Eliopoulos, before you make your comments, I think, Ms. Malm, we can bring this up at a future date. There's many questions.

Because I think rather than having an entire Pandora's box discussion right now about carve-outs with investments or carve-outs with phone calls, I think, Mr. Hoffner and Ms. Malm, let's just work towards this. Because I would

like an inventory -- or begin looking at the type of contracts that Mr. Juarez is just raising, because I think it just opens a little bit of a can of worms for everything that we're going to get engaged in. So we should see what's an easy piece to go forward, to build off what we already have. And then, Mr. Hoffner, absolutely right, every one of these items is either a federal or state statutory requirement not dictated by the terms of our contracts.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER HOFFNER: Correct.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: If that works with you -ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER JUAREZ: It does. If

it's not practical, you know - and go to your can-of-worms analogy - then let's, you know, reduce the size of the can of worms. But I would hope that we can get to a list of contracts where it does make a lot of sense to hold those contractors responsible for the way in which they treat their employees in particular in the area of a neutrality on collective bargaining arrangements.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Mr. Jelincic.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: Yeah, just some observations. In real estate the RCP kicks in if we own 50 percent at the time we get into the investment. If we own 49 and then buy another 10, it doesn't fall back under that policy.

Requiring legislative changes, maybe, at least for existing contracts. But there is no legislation that says we have a right not to invest in private equity firms if your goal is to privatize public jobs.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

So, I mean, we simply tell the vendor, if that's -- if you can't live with that, don't come to us.

On page 2, you say that construction contracts are exempt. I'm not sure that that's accurate. But if it is, that would explain LIUNA frustrations.

And on page 3 you talk about the underground regs. And clearly we have the ability to solve the problem of underground regs. Sometimes we make them and ignore them and other times we decide to fix them and make them real regs.

So those were the observations I had.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Mr. Whalen, you want to 17 come on up.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: All right. Any other Board members on this item?

MR. WHALEN: Good afternoon.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Hang on a second. your mic. You have three minutes. And please identify yourself.

MR. WHALEN: Good afternoon. Pat Whalen on behalf of Ellison Wilson here on behalf of our client, United Nurses Association of California Union of Health Care Professionals. Thank you, Mr. Chair and members.

First of all, just by way of brief background, we represent about 25,000 nurses, NPs, PAs, and other health care professionals at a wide variety of hospitals - Kaiser, Sharp, Tenet, Prime - many of whom are in Southern California.

I wanted to thank staff for their report on this issue, and urge -- urge -- kind of echo the comments of Mr. Juarez, urge you to do a little more work into the specific areas where insisting on things, like labor neutrality, would be appropriate. And I would like to suggest as one possible example would be the contracts that Calpers has with PPOs and HMOs, where our members happen to work.

As just one example of how this might be a benefit to CalPERS members, you may know that California law currently provides nurse staffing ratios at hospitals. And that's depending on patient acuity, in a NIC -- neonatal intensive care unit you might have a one-to-one or two-to-one ration, in other units it might be four nurses -- or four patients to a nurse, depending on the severity of the patient.

Numerous studies have shown that adhering to those nurse staffing ratios improve patient care and

improve patient outcomes.

You might not be so surprised to learn that some hospitals adhere to those ratios better than others. What we have found is that the hospitals that tend to adhere to those ratios and have improved patient outcomes are those where there is either collective bargaining and organized union representing the health care professionals or, at a minimum, labor neutrality.

And for that reason, we think it would be well worth exploring the utility and feasibility of putting those kinds of concepts in your contracts with HMOs. And so, like Mr. Juarez, we would urge the Board to have staff look more deeply into the legislative changes that would be necessary and the feasibility in areas and particular contracts where these type of provisions would work.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Thank you, sir.

All right. Any other comments on this item?

No.

All right. Thank you. Thank you, Ms. Malm.

All right. Final item. Item 11a, Asset

Liability Management Policy, first reading.

INTERIM CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER TIMBERLAKE

24 D'ADAMO: Yes. So Forrest is going to come up and present

25 | this item initially.

147

```
1
             CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Have Forrest present,
 2
    right?
 3
             INTERIM CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER TIMBERLAKE
 4
   D'ADAMO: Yes.
             CHIEF RISK OFFICER GRIMES: Good afternoon.
5
   Forrest Grimes, CalPERS team.
6
7
             The 2017-18 asset liability management cycle is
8
   now underway, and the Board and team will have several
9
    interactions on this topic moving forward.
10
             This is a first reading of this policy. So with
11
    that, I would like to stop and encourage your discussion
12
    and questions on the policy before you.
13
             CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Mr. Jelincic, I know you
14
    always have questions. Do you have any on this item?
15
             COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC:
                                         No
16
             CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Oh, good.
17
             Well, Forrest, you're in luck. There actually
18
    are no questions on it.
19
             CHIEF RISK OFFICER GRIMES: Okay. Well, thank
20
   you, and have a good afternoon.
21
             CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Thank you.
22
             (Laughter.)
23
             CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: All right. I believe that
```

Mr. Bilbrey, what time would you like to convene?

brings us to the end of our long day so far.

24

25

So convene at 2:35.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

That gives you enough time?

So this Committee will adjourn, and Performance and Compensation will convene at 2:35.

Thank you, all.

INTERIM CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER TIMBERLAKE

D'ADAMO: Do we want to do Committee direction?

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Oh, sure. I'm sorry.

See, you almost got up here. There was only a few items.

INTERIM CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER TIMBERLAKE

11 D'ADAMO: So I have, regarding the consent item on the IT

projects to come back to the Finance and Administration

13 | Committee with more detail.

Also the -- bring to the Board governance policy -- the Board Governance Committee the policy

16 revisions that came out of the delegation item.

And then to also bring back to the Finance and Administration Committee the delegation that we had deferred until after we had that heard in Board Governance Committee.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Correct.

INTERIM CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER TIMBERLAKE

D'ADAMO: I also had a recommendation about consider

carbon copying elected officials. This was on Item 10a

regarding the termination process.

1 CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Correct.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

INTERIM CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER TIMBERLAKE
D'ADAMO: And then a final recommendation to come back to
the Committee with some recommendations for the CMT
process beyond the 90 days. So maybe adding to the
timeline that we had showed you when the Board would
actually be notified of the terminations.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Great. That's it.

ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER JUAREZ: Excuse me.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Mr. Juarez.

ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER JUAREZ: Yeah, did I not just sit through a presentation that we also said we were going to come back with additional work being done on the RCP?

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: We're just getting there.

ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER JUAREZ: Okay. Well, I didn't hear that going. So I just wanted to make sure we don't get out of here with that --

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Your work here is done today.

ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER JUAREZ: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Thank you.

(Laughter.)

CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Anything else?

INTERIM CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER TIMBERLAKE

```
150
    D'ADAMO: Just what he said.
 1
             CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Okay. All right. Thank
 2
 3
                 Thank you.
    you. 2:35.
 4
             (Thereupon the California Public Employees'
 5
             Retirement System, Board of Administration,
             Finance & Administration Committee meeting
 6
             adjourned at 2:23 p.m.)
 7
 8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

## 1 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER I, JAMES F. PETERS, a Certified Shorthand 2 3 Reporter of the State of California, do hereby certify: That I am a disinterested person herein; that the 4 5 foregoing California Public Employees' Retirement System, Board of Administration, Finance & Administration 6 7 Committee meeting was reported in shorthand by me, James 8 F. Peters, a Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State of 9 California; 10 That the said proceedings was taken before me, in shorthand writing, and was thereafter transcribed, under 11 my direction, by computer-assisted transcription. 12 I further certify that I am not of counsel or 13 14 attorney for any of the parties to said meeting nor in any 15 way interested in the outcome of said meeting. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand 16 17 this 21st day of February, 18 James & Cotte

JAMES F. PETERS, CSR Certified Shorthand Reporter

License No. 10063

2.4

23

19

20

21

22

25